

**North American Numbering Council
Meeting Minutes
February 13, 2007 (Final)**

I. Time and Place of Meeting. The North American Numbering Council (NANC) held a meeting commencing at 9:30 a.m., at the Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, S.W., TW-C305, Washington, D. C.

II. List of Attendees.

Voting Council Members:

- | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. Thomas M. Koutsky | Chairman |
| 2. Henry Hultquist | AT&T |
| 3. Karen Reidy | CompTel |
| 4. Dena Hunter | Level 3 Communications, LLC |
| 5. Hon. Jack Goldberg | NARUC – Connecticut |
| 6. Michael Balch | NARUC – Iowa |
| 7. Don Gray | NARUC – Nebraska |
| 8. Hon. Philip B. Jones | NARUC – Washington |
| 9. Jerome Candelaria | NCTA |
| 10. Ray Strassburger | Nortel Networks |
| 11. John McHugh | OPASTCO |
| 12. Michael Whaley | Qwest |
| 13. Rosemary Emmer | Sprint Nextel |
| 14. Anna Miller | T-Mobile USA, Inc. |
| 15. Thomas Soroka, Jr. | USTA |
| 16. Philip Harrington | Verizon |
| 17. Martin Hakim Din | Vonage Holdings Corp. (Vonage) |

Special Members (Non-voting):

- | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| John Manning | NANPA |
| Jean-Paul Emard | ATIS |
| Amy Putnam | PA |
| Faith Marcotte | Welch & Company |

Commission Employees:

Marilyn Jones, Designated Federal Officer (DFO)
Deborah Blue, Assistant to the DFO
Thomas Navin, Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau
Renee Crittendon, Chief, Competition Policy Division
Christi Shewman, Deputy Chief, Competition Policy Division
Ann Stevens, Associate Chief, Competition Policy Division

Heather Hendrickson, Attorney, Competition Policy Division

III. Estimate of Public Attendance. Approximately 20 members of the public attended the meeting as observers.

IV. Documents Introduced.

- (1) Agenda
- (2) NANC Meeting Minutes – November 30, 2006
- (3) North American Numbering Plan Administration (NANPA) Report to the NANC
- (4) NANPA Newsletter
- (5) National Thousands Block Pooling Administrator Report to the NANC
- (6) Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Report to the NANC
- (7) Billing and Collection Agent Report to the NANC
- (8) NANP Fund Budget and Contribution Factor for July 2007 to June 2008
- (9) Billing and Collection Working Group (B&C WG) Report to the NANC
- (10) Numbering Oversight Working Group (NOWG) Report
- (11) pANI IMG Report to the NANC
- (12) Local Number Portability Administration (LNPA) Working Group Status Report to the NANC
- (13) Future of Numbering (FoN) Working Group Report to the NANC
- (14) List of NANC Accomplishments (January 2002 – February 13, 2007)

V. Summary of the Meeting.

NORTH AMERICAN NUMBERING COUNCIL

MEETING

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2007

Table of Contents

1. Announcements and Recent News	4
2. Approval of Transcript from November 30, 2006	11
3. Report of the North American Numbering Plan Administrator (NANPA)	14
4. Report of the National Thousands Block Pooling Administrator (PA)	24
5. Status of the Industry Numbering Committee (INC) activities	29
6. Report from the North American Numbering Plan Billing and	

Collection (NANP B&C) Agent	40
7. Report of the Billing and Collection Working Group (B&C WG)	45
8. Report of the Numbering Oversight Working Group (NOWG)	48
9. Reports from the pANI IMG Issues Management Groups (IMGs)	54
10. Report of the Local Number Portability Administration (LNPA) Working Group	59
11. Report of the Future of Numbering Working Group (FoN WG)	75
12. Special Presentations	--
13. Update List of the NANC Accomplishments	--
14. Summary of Action Items	--
15. Public Comments and Participation (five minutes per speaker)	78
16. Other Business	--

NORTH AMERICAN NUMBERING COUNCIL

Tuesday, February 13, 2007

(START OF AUDIOTAPE 1, SIDE A)

CHAIRMAN: We're going to try to get started here. Debbie is passing around a sign-in sheet. Debbie is it okay if we start while you're doing that?

DEBBIE: Sure.

Announcements and Recent News

CHAIRMAN: All right. Well, it is -- I think the last time that NANC got it, it was 70 degrees outside. And that was only about two and a half months ago, so welcome back to reality.

Welcome, everyone. I'm glad everyone made it in safely, those that we have, and hopefully we will do our best to stay on time. I know some people might have some early flights. I understand the Metro is shut down or not very well today. So we're probably going to have some people straggling in a little bit late. But we'll do our best to stay on time to get people out of here before the ice portion of your storm today begins.

Let's see. I actually wanted to start off with a couple administrative things, about meeting times and meetings. And I guess we might as well open it up to discussion.

It was actually brought to my attention that the meetings had started at 9:00 a.m. and that they were adjusted to 9:30 due to travel schedules for Bob Atkinson, our chair, for taking the train. You know, I live a half hour away from here so I don't have to take the train to get in here. So I would be more than willing to start these meetings at 9:00 a.m. on a going-forward basis. I know some of the working group co-chairs had indicated that that was fine with them, but obviously, you know, we need to make sure that this doesn't create a significant problem for anyone. So before, I just don't want to

change the meeting time willy-nilly without getting an indication of how many people fly in the morning of, and whether that would be a problem. And I would say if it's a problem for a couple members to get here then, you know, we'll just keep it to 9:30. So when do people think? Let me just toss it out.

Oh, the other thing I wanted to make clear before we start talking is, to make sure we have an accurate transcript, again we'll use this lift-your-little-nametag-up-before-you-when-you-speak. That will give the mic guy the clue to have your mic ready to go. So we'll actually begin the first part, we'll get the first part of what you say. And also, if everybody could be very careful about saying their name, at least their name and their affiliation, at least one of those two things before they speak, so we have an accurate transcript that reflects it. And part of that is involved in making sure the mic is on at the time. So, before I open up the meeting time discussion for at least a couple of minutes, I just wanted to remind people of that.

So what do people think about starting at 9:00 a.m.? I spoke with the Commission, and they said it was fine with them. Is there any significant objection to starting at 9:00? I see heads shaking around the table. No? Enough people get here the night before? I know Commissioner Jones flies in. Does that work?

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: (Indiscernible.)

CHAIRMAN: 9:00 a.m. works fine for you guys from Washington? I think you have the hardest commute of anyone, except for California.

COMMISSIONER JONES: (Indiscernible.)

CHAIRMAN: You're fine? Okay? All right. Then I think from now on when we have meetings we'll start them at 9:00. And I think having that extra half hour will be a good idea.

The other thing I also want to talk about was the meeting schedule and the process that we're going to be using in terms of setting up meetings. And this again, I've spoken with I think several of you about, but I can't assume that all of you know about what I'm really -- we're going to try to do meeting scheduling a little differently than it's been done in the past. Instead of creating essentially a year's worth of meeting dates, we're essentially going to try to look a couple meetings in the future and get an indication of about what's going to be talked about at the meetings. And this is actually an idea that I think makes a lot of sense. I want to make sure that our meetings are what we call high value and productive in terms of actually affirmatively addressing particular topics in detail, and to work more closely with the working groups to kind of say, all right, I think I can have X-Y-Z project ready for a meeting in April or a meeting in July. And then rather than spending 15 minutes talking about it and having the potential to cut off the date because we're running out of time because we're trying to get to everyone else, I'd like to have the flexibility to maybe schedule 45 minutes or an hour to a particular topic that I think might warrant it. That of course depends on whether or not we have, the idea that, okay, at this particular meeting this working group intends to have this project completed.

So that is going to be a little bit more flexible. I think we are going to try and target particular timeframes for meetings, such as we discussed last time to essentially have a, I don't want to say an expectation, but at least an understanding that, you know, our next meeting might be in the late spring, probably in the April timeframe, and then the meeting some time in the June/July timeframe, and then something else later, in the second half of the year. But it's to have more ideas of targets as to time windows. And a lot of this has to do with scheduling of this room as well, and just the fact that, you know,

picking a date in November for a meeting at this point in time, I think, you know, it's going to be so much subject to change anyway, depending on whether or not it's on our agenda. But I'm not sure how much value that gives.

Now, I know I've heard from some people saying that that actually has some important values, so I do want to kind of open it up as to what my people might think about how we would do that, whether, how we can best manage that process, how much - particularly I'm trying to figure out how much lead time do members need to make sure that they can make their travel arrangements specifically. I think that's perhaps the most important piece of fact. I know 30 days is probably pushing it too short, but we have to provide notice of 20 days, 25 days anyway.

So what do people think about that? Anna?

MS. MILLER: Anna Miller with T-Mobile. If we can plan on at least two months ahead that will be helpful. I participate in a lot of industry forums. And they have schedules, you know. Most of them have scheduled their meetings for the year. So as those dates get locked in, it gets more and more difficult for me, you know. I may be consumed at that time. I can't manage my responsibilities here. If the dates are overlapping that makes it very difficult. So I think the further out, the better. But at least I think two months would be helpful.

CHAIRMAN: I will point out that we do look at the meeting dates of the Industry Numbering Committee and NARUC, actually for the NARUC Commissioners, to at least make sure we're not conflicting with those, and also to the extent that, like if the LLC has a meeting or something like that. If people want to provide me lists on industry-like activity dates and calendars that we should be mindful of when setting a particular date, everyone is more than welcome to do that. Yes, Rosemary?

MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint Nextel. To add to what Anna said, from a budgeting perspective it makes it very difficult not to know whether you're going to have one, two, three, or zero meetings. And so again, if you could have at least a two-month timeframe or window of opportunity, if you schedule for one and you end up having three it would give you time to allow for internal processes to work itself though so that you might have more than just an (indiscernible) at the meeting.

MS. MILLER: That would be another reason why it would be important to give us as much notice as possible.

CHAIRMAN: Sure. And I do anticipate there being at least some indication of timeframes, because again part of this idea I have is that the working groups will be working more on particular ideas to say, we think we can have this done by a June meeting or so. So obviously to do that, they need to know whether there's at least some kind of expectation of a June meeting, etc. So I do think that that type of stuff will have some target time windows I think in terms of meetings. And then ultimately I think we'll have the decision as to whether we have a critical mass of issues put together to go forward and also an indication as to importance in timing. If it turns out there's only one critical issue that needs to be addressed in the October meeting, we may decide how quick we want to make a judgment as to how critical that is, etc. The heaviest things will be driven by the agenda, rather than be driven by just kind of a schedule that we happen to have. Yes?

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: (Indiscernible.) I would also agree with Anna and Rosemary about the two months. But also when setting up the schedule, if we do have a need for a discussion that's going to last quite a while, two to three hours, to know of that at least a month or two in advance as well so that those of us who fly in, will know

we have to stay over an extra night.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: So just to keep that also in mind.

CHAIRMAN: I don't think we'll ever have two-day meetings unless --

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: Oh, no. I'm not saying that. It's just like for me flying to Colorado, I have one flight a night and that's it.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: So, I just know I have to plan to stay another night. That's all.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. And I think to a certain extent, I mean, if a working group is thinking about presenting something possibly a month or two out, obviously it's kind of hard to guarantee that they'll achieve (indiscernible) by then. Or it may just, maybe something that we thought might have been controversial turns out not to be, or vice versa. So, yes, and I think that's kind of part of it, that there would be open communication to say that we're going to be looking at, these -- well, we're probably going to be looking at these topics at that upcoming meeting.

All right. Actually at the last meeting I felt bad about cutting some people off and cutting off some discussion of some things just in order to kind of stick to a schedule. And I'd actually, in my perfect vision of the world, would almost like a working group to say, you know, I don't really have anything this meeting, but next meeting I'm going to have a lot. So I'd like an hour next time and only 15 minutes now. That's kind of the dynamic I want to have if at all possible. Yes?

MS. MILLER: Anna Miller, T-Mobile. I guess one thing I was wondering about and if like you said there was just one action item or one working group that needed a

major action item, then would it be possible to address that via a conference call, a (indiscernible) conference call versus a face-to-face? I think we should try to limit that because to me the benefit of having face-to-face meetings is to have more communication and input from the NANC members and the stakeholders that they represent, because this is one of the few forums, I think, where so many affected parties, so many interest groups in the industry come together and have an opportunity to discuss issues. But if there is an issue like something came up and -- what the NOWG and they had one action item, or the LNP working group had one action item. Maybe we could just, instead of having a face-to-face, consider having a conference call to focus on that.

CHAIRMAN: That's possible. I'm personally not a big fan of conference call meetings.

MS. MILLER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN: Because honestly we have to go through the same -- to me at NANC we have to go through the same administrative -- under the Federal (indiscernible) Committee Act, we have to go through the same administrative notice issues anyway. So I can't just say, let's have a conference call next week about topic X. I still have to provide public notice, public participation. How do you get public participation on a conference call? You know, it means you've got to like -- with the public notice with a dial-in number. Yes.

MS. MILLER: So it's not worth the effort for just --

CHAIRMAN: Well, I'm not saying the candle's not worth the game, but I'm just thinking that we might have to make a judgment call as to how, if at the same time we're faced with something that's really important to get done and needs to get done, then we will address it in that manner. But I agree with you. I think there is a value to doing

face-to-face meetings. And actually given the alternative, I'd rather have less face-to-face meetings than more conference calls, if that makes sense. Rosemary?

MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint Nextel. I know that we've already had a conference call with the co-chairs and you to discuss this, and some of us have already tried to argue our position regarding not having scheduled dates. So I won't rehash that. But I did want to say at least for the record that when you're chairing committees underneath the NANC umbrella or that are specifically chartered by the NANC, it makes it very difficult trying to be the cheerleader, if you will, with these groups to help with the motivation of the group in order to work through these very tough issues that we have to work through, without knowing that there is a place to put your stake in the ground at least at some point in the future to be able to say in public or know for sure that folks are going to be reading the materials that you're putting forth and working so hard on, without actually knowing if we would meet again, let alone knowing what the date is just makes it that much more difficult for the committees that are under this particular advisory group. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: That's noted. And there's a good movie line in there. We shall meet again. I forgot what movie that's from. But it is noted and I do understand that a lot of the work of the working groups is volunteer group that people fit into their regular jobs. And I do think that is an important consideration and it is, people up here do know that and understand.

Approval of Transcript

So, okay, if there are no other thoughts on that, I think we'll go to the transcript, or the approval of the meeting transcript. This is actually, some of you may not know,

but we're actually going to be doing meeting transcripts which I prefer over minutes because they tend to be more accurate. They involve a lot less work as well, and it results in a, you have the issue of the minutes being incomplete and the transcript, you know, not conflicting with the minutes. So I'd like us to do the -- we're going to be doing meeting transcripts. We're going to send those out as soon as we basically can for people to edit and have their suggestions on. So do we have any suggestions on the meeting transcript of November 30th? Yes?

JEROME CANDELARIA: -- on page 92 I wanted to identify myself as the male speaker halfway down.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. And knowing that, if, I mean -- you're the male speaker? Okay. Every time it says male speaker? Is that --

MR. CANDELARIA: Yes. No, just on 92.

CHAIRMAN: You disavow every other male speaker. And I realize this is different, and frankly if people still have other -- you know, if they want to take another shot at looking at these and saying, trying to identify themselves or whatever. I'm sorry, Rosemary. Oh, you're still up.

MS. MILLER: (Indiscernible.)

CHAIRMAN: Yes. I'm going to kind of, without objection I'm going to have deemed these approved. But if people really want to go over it again, we can look at them next time. Yes (indiscernible)?

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: (Indiscernible) well I guess I'm just a little vague on what it means to approve a transcript.

CHAIRMAN: Well, yes.

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: I mean, are saying that it's generally accurate?

CHAIRMAN: Sufficient for posting to the public, that you're comfortable that somebody didn't say something that, you know, or that you don't feel that you were, that it was inaccurate in some sense. So we're approving the accuracy of the transcript.

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: And does that mean we won't have meeting minutes?

CHAIRMAN: Yes. The public record will be the transcript. We're required to, as a federal advisory committee, make proceedings public and post it essentially. And I personally would rather post the transcript, because that is complete and 100 percent accurate. Yes, Rosemary?

MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer with Sprint Nextel. I just wanted to make sure that it's clear that the transcripts we're approving are basically what people said. And it's not necessarily true in every case that someone said something right, because there could be something in the transcript that someone on this panel said that may in fact not be completely 100 percent true if they were maybe referring to numbers of some sort. I just wanted to state that in my opinion for the record, if we're approving the transcripts, it's basically transcripts of what people said and not the validity of what people said.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS. EMMER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: It's an approval of the accuracy of the words that are contained in the document, not -- and that can happen in meeting minutes, too. Okay? And, like I said, because, you know, if people want to come to me and say, hey, that was, you know, I'm the male speaker on page 98, you know, I think we can realize that, too. Eventually we're going to close the book on them, but right now I know it's a different way of doing it. But I think it's actually more complete and more comprehensive to do it this way, and

I think it's actually going to have ultimately more value as we go back and look at transcripts three or four years from now, and try and figure out exactly why we did what we did.

Okay. Excuse me? Oh, Commissioner Jones. I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER JONES: Is a motion in order to approve the transcripts?

CHAIRMAN: Yes, if somebody would like to make it.

COMMISSIONER JONES: I move that we adopt the transcripts.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. Is there a second? Don? Don Gray seconded. Okay. Anybody objecting? Okay. Then the transcripts approved subject to the caveat that Rosemary stated.

All right. Now we'll move on to the actual business of the meeting. The NANPA Administrator is first, John.

Report of the North American Plan Administrator (NANPA)

MR. MANNING: Good morning, everybody. I am John Manning with NANPA. Would you like to number this document?

CHAIRMAN: Yes. It's -- well, this document, do you mean the NANPA report?

MR. MANNING: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: That's Number 1. Agenda Number 1.

DEBBIE BLUE: The Agenda is number 1.

CHAIRMAN: Oh, the Agenda is number 1, the NANPA is number 2.

CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MS. BLUE: The Agenda is number 1, the Transcript is number 2, and the NANPA Report is number 3.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. Just so we get that on the transcript, the meeting agenda is

Exhibit Number 1, the transcript from the last meeting is Exhibit Number 2, and the NANPA Report is Exhibit Number 3.

MR. MANNING: Good morning again. What I'll cover with you this morning is an update on the CO code activity in the month of January, as well as review with you some numbers from 2006. I will also talk about the area code inventory and relief planning activities that are underway. I also want to cover with you an update on some of the other NANP resources that we administer, looking at their activity over 2006, quickly address some change orders that have been recently approved by the FCC, and some final notes on the NANPA newsletter and the NANPA annual report.

Page 2 of my presentation gives you an overview of CO code assignment, denial, reclamation activities in the month of January 2007. You'll see we assigned 340 codes and we had 34 returned.

On page 3 I provide a comparison of 2006 with 2005 and 2004. In 2006 we have 4,079 codes assigned, and compared with 2005 and 2004 you can see the total quantity assigned in those years. 2006 assignments increased approximately 760 codes over 2005. Maybe of interest as well is that net assignments in 2006 were approximately 3,400 codes, were up over 1,000 codes as compared to 2004 and 2005. And you can see in the third bullet item on my report that the quantity of returned codes in 2006 dropped approximately 30% as compared to the previous two years. So the quantity of codes that were returned in 2006 was somewhat less than what we've experienced in the past two years. And I made note on the report that the increase in the number of changes in 2006 compared to the previous two years was due primarily to some mass operating company number, or OCN changes submitted by just a few service providers. So when you look at 2006 compared to 2005 and 2004, you can see a general upturn in the quantity of CO

code assignments.

In terms of CO code information, I wanted to remind the NANC of several reports that are available on the NANPA public website. I've listed them here in the middle of page 3 of the report. Of interest is a particular report if you want to get some historical information about what is going on in individual area codes. It is the fourth bulleted report called "Central Office Code Assignment Activity Records". And that particular report gives you the assignment activity on a month-by-month basis for each area code in which NANPA administers the CO codes. It also tells you the quantity of codes that have been returned in a particular month as well as year to date.

I pointed out this particular report because I used that information to come up with the chart on page 4. At the top of page 4 I give you the top ten NPAs in terms of code assignments for 2006. The chart shows you the quantity of net assignments. That is of course the total of assignments made minus those codes that were returned. The top NPA was New York's 347. Iowa came in second and third with area code 515 and 641. And rounding out the top five, Minnesota, 507 and Kentucky, 270. You'll notice California is the sixth one. That's 424. That is the area code that relieved area code 310. And then you have North Carolina, 704 which, for those of your that are not familiar with North Carolina, is the Charlotte area. Alabama and then Texas round out the last two NPAs in the top ten.

I found that interesting because four of the top five area codes were in states that you wouldn't necessarily point to as being the top CO code assignments that one would typically expect. But indeed that is the case. And I'm referring to Iowa, Minnesota, and Kentucky.

Any questions with regard to CO code assignment information? Jerome?

JEROME: Jerome Candelaria. You referenced the reports. Do the reports break down CO code assignments to paging companies who aren't required to participate in pooling?

MR. MANNING: No, they do not.

JEROME: Well, I'm wondering if that's, in some future report you will give us just a snapshot of utilization or assignment of CO codes to paging.

MR. MANNING: That's not really possible because in that regard we would have to be generally going off the name of the company, because on the part one they don't indicate specifically to us -- they don't have to indicate specifically to us what type of service that they're offering. And we don't make that information public. So I don't have in my possession specific information to definitively identify a particular entity as using a code for paging versus wireless, for example.

JEROME: Are you at least able to track even in a very general sense the utilization level of those NXX codes by paging companies?

MR. MANNING: Well, certainly we would have the utilization levels via the NRUF process. Again though, from that perspective NRUF is submitted on an operating company number perspective. So we would have to attempt to try to define a particular OCN as specifically dedicated for paging. And that is not necessarily the easiest thing to do in terms of the data that we have. I do know some of the reports that are provided by the FCC, one recently done by the FCC using December of 2005 data -- I haven't gone through in detail on that report, but I believe they attempt to try to break that out in terms of the wireless versus paging. But I'd have to check that specifically, Jerome.

KEN: Ken (indiscernible) with AT&T. John, since you brought up the point of the apparent counter-intuitiveness of the fastest, the largest number of CO code

assignments, I have to ask if you have any hypothesis as to what's going on there.

MR. MANNING: No, I don't have anything specifically I can say definitively. I did go back and take a look at who got the codes in those particular instances. And the majority of the codes, for example in Kentucky, 270, as well as in Minnesota, 507, the majority of the codes, nearly all of the codes were initial applications.

KEN: In Iowa?

MR. MANNING: Not in Iowa. Iowa's quite the different -- those were growth codes. In the two NPAs we were looking at, we had four entities generally get nearly all of those code assignments.

KEN: Thanks.

MR. MANNING: If you recall from our November meeting, a representative from Iowa Commission remarked about what was going on in those particular area codes. Minnesota was generally the same thing as well. They were initial applications. My understanding is that there is some activity with certain companies working with the cable industry and helping them gain their footprint into the telecommunications market as well as they may be working with some mobile virtual network operators as well, and getting resources that they in turn can provide to those entities.

KEN: Thanks, John.

MR. MANNING: Sure. By the way, just so you know, New York was all over the board, general and initial growth.

KEN: I just have one -- you had said I guess in Iowa four entities received -- was it the majority of the codes --

MR. MANNING: Yes.

KEN: -- or was it --

MR. MANNING: The majority of the codes, yes.

KEN: Okay.

MR. MANNING: Over the two NPAs, four entities were the primary recipients of the CO codes. Just one little factoid. If you ever are interested, the top five states, Texas is number one, California is number two, New York, number three, Florida, number four, and there's Iowa at number five, in terms of CO code assignments in 2006.

On page four I give you an inventory of area codes. It would be comparing January 1, 2006 with January 1, 2007. In 2006 we assigned two area codes. One was for relief, the Illinois 217, the other one was in relief of the NPA 505 in New Mexico. In 2006 we had four area codes go into service: one in Georgia, 761, California's 424, and we had two area codes go into service in Canada.

With regard to area code relief planning activities, I wanted to highlight a couple of area codes. Number one, on page five, top of page, Illinois NPA 630, we are in a hold mode on that. I am expecting that we will have the implementation of the new 331 area code overlay the 630 area code sometime in 2007. We only have a handful, somewhere in the neighborhood of five CO codes available for assignment in 630. West Virginia 304, I have mentioned in our November meeting that they had issued an order requiring more pooling in 304. Just recently the Commission has requested additional information from the services providers operating in 304 about the impacts of doing an area code split in that area code.

Other relief activities, we are on the verge of seeing a new area code come into services. That's for relief in the Illinois area code 815. The 779 will become effective with codes becoming effective out of the 779 in March. Kentucky has some activity underway there where they have requested additional authority to do some more pooling.

California's 714 and California 760 are kind of moving on the same track. They just recently conducted some public meetings in California for 714, and they're underway with similar-type meetings for 760. And in Oregon, there is now a plan in place to extend the 971 overlay over the remaining portion of 503 that presently does not have that overlay in place. Dates, permissive dialing will begin on October 21, 2007. That being permissive dialing of ten digits in the non-overlay portion of 503. And mandatory dialing starts in April of 2008 so that the 971 central office codes will become available in all of the area code 503. Any questions on area codes or relief planning?

On page six I give an overview of some of the other resources that NANPA administers. Year-end totals for 2006 -- I'll briefly run through these focusing primarily on the tables. The first table outlines carrier identification code CIC assignments for future group B (as in bravo). You'll see there were no assignments for future group B kicks (phonetic sp.) in 2006, yet we got 72 back. You can see it's fairly, that the use of this particular resources has declined.

For feature group D CICs, on page seven you can see the chart. We assigned 99 codes. We reclaimed 128, and you can see over the past seven years the quantity that we've assigned and the quantity that we've reclaimed. Basically we have -- with the reclamations in place we have 81 net assignments over the last seven years.

For the 500 area code we assigned 62 NXXs and reclaimed 34, with a net quantity assignment of 28. This is the area code that I mentioned at our November meeting that we're looking to exhaust as soon as in the next two years. Assignments do continue in this particular area code. And the issue with regard to relief of the 500 area code is presently in the Industry Numbering Committee.

The 900 area code on page eight, no assignments in 2006 and we recovered 11

codes. And you can see the activity on that particular NPA over the last seven years. And finally, for 555 line numbers we had two assignments in 2006.

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: John, if you don't mind, I'd like to go back to the 500 codes. First I do kind of want to highlight that. It was, according to this document at the last meeting, the projected exhaust was 3.8 years, and now it's less than two. Is that -- I just wanted to really almost restate that.

MR. MANNING: Yes. We had originally, using information, had thought we were going to be exhausted anywhere from three to five years. But with the information that we got in November, primarily the forecast that we had recently received, that was driving the exhaust of the remaining approximately 200 codes that we thought we were going to be seeing exhausted in the next two years.

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: Okay. So that's based on more recent --

MR. MANNING: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: Okay, the forecast that's come in the last month or two?

MR. MANNING: Within the last month or two.

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: I guess almost kind of similar to what Hank was asking, is there a particular, is there a way to try and get a sense of the source for these new requests or this uptake in demand?

MR. MANNING: Well, we will continue to see initial assignments, but we are seeing continual assignments to entities that are using these resources. It's my understanding they use them for a number of different wireless type of services that are not necessarily services that you call, but they are services that are used -- an example would be delivery services where you need to call into a central location or be reached by

a central location to track packages and stuff, assignment to those types of devices, as well as, you know, I know these numbers have been used for things used in automobiles and things like that, although I don't know if that's really continuing or not. There may be a push to go to more geographic numbering on that. But that is what we're experiencing, and it's those types of services where we're seeing forecasts from services providers that indicate we're going to need some more of these in the next two years.

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: And maybe this is the type of thing that we can think about for next time, just to kind of -- I think giving a breakdown as to new requests or requests from existing providers for additional resources as opposed to new resources, I think, particularly on this area code.

MR. MANNING: We can give you a breakdown of initial versus code assignments in 500. I don't know how far back we can go, but at least we can certainly go through the last couple of years and (indiscernible).

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: Yes. I think that's the timeframe. I think that would be useful so we can possibly get an understanding of this geographic code.

MR. MANNING: Any other questions on the other resources? Okay. Moving on to page 9, NANPA had two outstanding change orders the last time we got together. Both of these change orders were approved by the Commission on January 25th.

Change Order Number 8 is a change order that requires NANPA to check to see if there are any active or pending ports on a code in which the service provider desires to change the associated rate center. If there are active or pending ports, then the application will be denied. If there are none, then the application must meet all the other criteria for it to be approved.

Change Order Number 9 is a change order again responding to an INC issue.

This permits a service provider who to submit a Part 4 -- that's a confirmation of in-service for a non-pool dedicated code attained via the pooling administrator, to submit that Part 4 directly to NANPA, and that NANPA is required to send a confirmation of receipt of the Part 4, known as a Part 5, to the service provider as well as well as to the Pooling Administrator. Timeframe for implementation of these are going to either be in late March or early April.

The final two items I just want to make note of, the NANPA newsletter was posted to the NANPA website in early January. I make reference to this newsletter a lot, but I don't know how many of you actually go in and take a look at the newsletter. So I have provided the NANC members a copy of the latest version of that newsletter just so you know what's there and get an idea of what it's all about.

CHAIRMAN: Would you like to make that an exhibit, or --

MR. MANNING: It's up to you.

CHAIRMAN: We've talked about it. We might as well.

MR. MANNING: Okay.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. We'll make it Exhibit 4.

MR. MANNING: Okay. Again, we try to provide updated information about CO code assignments, relief activity, and any other information of current events that are taking place in the industry that might be of interest to the service provider community as well as to any of the regulators, and any other entities that are interested in the numbering world.

We are currently in the process of putting together our 2006 NANPA Annual Report. That report is scheduled to be posted to the website at the end of March, and of course appropriate notification will be sent out to the industry as well as to the NANC

when it is available.

And finally, I wanted to make note of, just that the NANPA 2006 Annual Performance Survey has been posted to the NANPA website. A notification was sent out in early January and a reminder sent out just a few weeks ago about that survey, and trying to encourage folks to complete it and submit it to the NOWG.

That concludes my presentation.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you, John. Does anybody have any questions for John, who's given us a very complete report? I appreciate it.

I think Amy is next, the Pooling Administrator. Go ahead.

Report of the National Thousands Block Pooling Administrator (PA)

MS. PUTNAM: I just want to start out by saying pooling is so fine it's blowing in the wind.

CHAIRMAN: Amy has a presentation which we'll mark as Exhibit 5. It's a report of the National Thousands Block Pooling Administrator.

MS. PUTNAM: Thank you. If you look at slide 2 of the presentation it indicates the Pooling Administration activity summary data for the past 12 months, showing that in December and January we were between 7,000 and 8,000 Part 3s.

Slide 3 is the summary data as requested by the FCC a couple of years ago for the 12-months preceding.

Slide 4 is CO codes open during the past 12 months showing in particular that our pool replenishments continue to grow as we lose the cushion that we had in some rate centers from the initial donations. Over time, more and more rate centers run out of those initial donations and we have to open more codes for pool replenishment. So that number is tending upwards. The number of rate centers changed from M* to M, which is rate

centers with a single service provider moving to rate centers with multiple service providers. It tends to be slowing down.

Slide 5 shows the status of our change orders. We had three change orders submitted since the last NANC meeting, and of those two of them were approved as you see in the list there. Change Order 44, going through them very briefly, modified the Part 1-A form to include a remarks section relating to whether a block was contaminated. Change Order 47 again addressed an INC issue. The relevant changes in the INC guidelines revised the Part 4 Form. And those modifications required, as many of these do, the modifications in INC guidelines required modifications to the Pooling Administration System. Change Order 49 addresses INC issue 523 and relates to a problem that we had with LERG assignees sometimes submitting a Part 4 without having sent in a notification that the code was opened in the PSTN. And so the TBPAG was revised to require that the LERG assignee notify us, the Pooling Administrator, of code activation status prior to submitting the Part 4. And if we don't get that notification, we will not accept the Part 4. That encourages carriers to open it in the PSTN, making those blocks available to other carriers for assignments.

Rosemary, did you have a question? I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN: That's okay. I had missed it.

MS. PUTNAM: Oh.

MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint Nextel. I have a question on the change orders. It looks like Change Order 48 was submitted in October, but it looks like you've received a number of approved change orders recently, December and January. I was wondering if you had any indication or if you received any feedback regarding Change Order 48.

MS. PUTNAM: Yes. We are gathering information for the FCC at the request of the FCC to get a better analysis of Change Order 48 now that we have some history. And that's why that change order has not yet been approved. We will be negotiating that change order further with them.

MS. EMMER: Thank you.

MS. PUTNAM: And Change Order 45, we withdrew that change order because of the issues in Change Order 45 were discussed in the technical requirements document. And so we simply withdrew Change Order 45 totally in order to try to have a clean slate across the board with respect to the technical requirements document in the pending re-bid.

Any other questions on change orders?

Slide 6 shows that our system was up 100% of the time again, 100% of the time during 2006.

Slide 7 shows our other activities with respect to the status of the existing contract. As you recall, the base contract ended in June. We received an extension, and then subsequently received a second extension. The second extension, like the first one, was three months with two, one-month additional options. The FCC just the other day exercised its first one-month option extending the contract to March 14th, 2007. And there is a second option still on the table to extend it to April 14th, 2007.

With respect to the performance evaluation, we posted the Annual Performance Survey to our website January 2nd, and we have sent an e-mail with documents and an e-mail reminder out to carriers.

I'm not going to go through the details of the delegated authority petition update. It's broken out by state just giving a little status report on what's going on in the different

states.

With respect to the Interim Routing Number Authority Administration, the IRNA, as of January 31st there had been five registrations received. Four were approved, one was denied for lack of an OCN. As of January 31st there had been no requests for ESQs, but we actually since January 31st have had a request and have denied it. And we have been working with the INC on develop --

(END OF AUDIOTAPE 1, SIDE 1)

* * * * *

(START OF AUDIOTAPE 1, SIDE 2)

MS. PUTNAM: -- yesterday. In fact our subgroup had a couple of hour meeting and we have a couple more scheduled, going through the guidelines making proposed suggestions or additions, to make the guidelines relevant to pANI but similar to existing guidelines.

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: Amy, if I could ask, you had mentioned you had one request for resources that was denied. Are you free to discuss the basis of the denial?

MS. PUTNAM: The basis of the denial was that the applicant was using a certification from a different state.

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: Okay. A state different than the one they were requesting resources?

MS. PUTNAM: A state different from the one in which they were requesting resources.

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: Okay. Thank you.

MS. PUTNAM: And slide 10, we monitor the Office of Management and Budget

website for any changes to MSAs that could affect us in any way, either changing something having to do with the top 100 MSAs -- sometimes in the past ONB has changed the definition of what an MSA is, has moved counties in and out of MSAs, has consolidated MSAs, or has broken them up. So we monitor that website to be assured that we are consistent with whatever information is on that website. They did issue another bulletin, 0701, and it was a very minimal affect on us. It changed the names of four MSAs. It did not change any of the MSAs in the top 100 MSAs, and we modified the website to reflect the name changes. And that is shown on the slide.

Our annual report is on target for a March 31st submission to the FCC. And of course after that it will be posted on the website. We are to get the draft report to the NOWG February 21st. They will have between a week and two weeks to review it, and then there is a call scheduled with us to review it with them. I'm sure that will be covered in the NOWG report.

One other thing that we did recently, actually this week, the INC had requested that we poll service providers for suggestions for pool replenishment. We asked them delicately basically why service providers don't want to open codes, and if there's anything that can be done about it. That was at the behest of the INC. I'm not holding my breath expecting a whole lot of answers, but nevertheless the request is out there.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you, Amy. Further questions? Rosemary? No?

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: (Indiscernible.)

CHAIRMAN: When you put yours down, that's when I know you have a question.

You know, I had actually scheduled a break here, but I think if INC wants to go now and provide their presentation -- are you ready, Kim? I mean, we might as well

since we're all fresh still.

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: (Indiscernible.)

CHAIRMAN: Sure. This is the Industry Numbering Committee Report to NANC by Ken Havens, the Industry Numbering Committee Chair. It's a Powerpoint document, the prettiest we have today I think.

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: We tried.

CHAIRMAN: No, no. I'm sorry. John's newsletter. This will be Exhibit 6.

Status of the Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Activities

MR. HAVENS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ken Havens, INC Chair. If you refer to slide 2, you'll note that INC had two meetings since the last NANC meeting, and that we have our next meeting scheduled in April, about two and half months out.

Going to the third slide, the permanent pANI guidelines issue is being worked in our CO/NXX subcommittee. The first slide merely makes reference to the fact that the INC got down to work right after it was assigned the interim guidelines at the last NANC meeting, and that the INC is working very closely with ESIF-H subcommittee which does include NENA members. And we have been meeting on a continuous basis to develop draft guidelines. We have over 30 contributions submitted thus far against the pANI guidelines. We have approximately 12 future meetings scheduled to drive out the final guidelines. We have identified a shell of a document, if you will, outlined what the document should look like, basically taking the pANI, the interim guidelines, comparing those against what we have for our Thousands Block assignment guidelines, and coddling together a format which we think suits the pANI guidelines. The INC believes at this point that it is on schedule to meet the goal of completing the guidelines by its March 9th deadline, and that should any issues arise regarding policy the INC and ESIF will contact

either NANC or the pANI IMG with those questions.

Mr. Chairman, with regards to that last bullet, would you prefer that we go directly to the IMG, or come to you directly?

CHAIRMAN: It's probably best to come to both simultaneously I think. I'll just end up passing it to the IMG, but given that, and I know you guys are doing a lot of work in a very short time period. So it's just to make sure it -- and which I greatly appreciate, but I think it's probably best just to, I would just contact, you know, the co-chairs and myself through an e-mail simultaneously is probably the easiest.

MR. HAVENS: Okay. Are there any questions? Don, go ahead.

MR. GRAY: Don Gray, Nebraska Public Service Commission. Ken do you have the running number of hours that the group has spent on this so far?

MR. HAVENS: We don't. Certainly we could compile that information if necessary.

MR. GRAY: I was just curious because I think people would be very surprised and impressed the amount of effort that is being put in on this guideline. And I think it's important that all of the stakeholders recognize how much effort is going forth on this.

MR. HAVENS: Well, I think frankly we've had about six meetings thus far not including face-to-face meetings. We've got, I think, 12 scheduled meetings to go, and they last about three hours a piece. So you do the math.

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: (Indiscernible.)

MR. HAVENS: Yes. It is a significant contribution by the industry to getting the guidelines for the permanent pANI administration put together on a timely basis, you know, based on the statement by the FCC Bureau that they believed the national solution was in the public interest. And I think that the industry is really stepping up on this. I

appreciate it.

MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint Nextel. That was an excellent suggestion. NANC has asked the NOWG every year to compile how many man hours they spend specifically on the PA and then the alpha reviews. And so I think that it would be an excellent idea going forward to keep track of that number. So thank you.

MR. HAVENS: We'd be happy to do that. Any other questions?

Slide 5 talks about an issue, Issue 322, removal of the switch information from the Part 1 form. We have two slides that comprise this issue. The first slide attempts to give a little history behind the issue, and then the second slide, some more history and sort of where we are, some of the things that have gone on. So if you'll bear with me for just a moment, we brought this issue or closed this issue back in 2002.

The intent of the issue that was brought in was to remove switch information from Part 1 forms. And the reason that we wanted that to occur was it was noted that switching information, which is included on Part 1 forms and then subsequently included in the NANPA database, the INC believes is no longer relevant information. And that is because today codes are assigned no longer at a switch level, but rather at a rate-center level. Also today numbers are ported in between switches which, when that occurs the switch information loses relevance.

And then switching information as noted in bullet 3 is required on these various Part 1 forms and it causes the industry to maintain synchronous data in more than one database, which leads to inefficiencies, database discrepancies and added costs for all involved. So this information is being included on the Part 1 forms, it's included in NANPA. However, switch information is also input into the Telcordia LERG database, which is the database of record for switch information. It's probably worthy to note that

information when entered under the Part 1 forms into the NAS system is not validated for accuracy.

On slide 2, another reason that the INC felt that this information should be removed from the forms is that there are issues of national security relative to that information being made available on public websites, and that the FCC NRIC VI Best Practices along with the NIIF NRRIC issue raised those particular concerns.

So up to this point, I've sort of outlined you some of the reasons for wanting to have that switch information removed from those forms. And back in February of '04, the INC closed the issue. A change order was requested. It was sent to the FCC approval in 2000 -- excuse me, in February of '04 the FCC rejected the change order for the reasons that there were some particular states that wanted that information available from the NANPA and received reports from NANPA with switch information. And so the INC sought to find out really what were the reasons behind some states wanting to maintain that information or have availability to that information, because that same information is available on Telcordia BIRRDS products. And so there was an opportunity for, we believe, states to have that information via the BIRRDS products. So Don Gray assisted the INC by inquiring through the various regulatory groups to find out what states wanted to maintain that information, wanted availability to that information, and the reasons for wanting that information. And he did that for approximately the last couple of years. And at this point the reasons for that are still unclear. And we understand that there's just a few states that want to maintain that information, who want availability to that information.

At this point, Telcordia has volunteered to do a LERG online demonstration to regulatory groups and to particular state regulators to demonstrate the information, the

switch information that states may want access to, to see if they're, to do a side-by-side comparison, if you will. And so the bottom line is that the INC wanted to bring you up to speed on where this is, and to find out hopefully in the next couple of months whether or not states would be able to view the information given by Telcordia and find it as a suitable substitute.

Are there any questions?

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: I guess the question I have is when was the offer made by Telcordia (indiscernible)?

MR. HAVENS: Well, it has been made --

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: -- if Telcordia wants to speak.

MR. HAVENS: Adam, would you like to speak to that?

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: (Indiscernible.)

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: I just want the record to reflect my --

MR. NEWMAN: Adam Newman, Telcordia Technologies. I sent e-mail to Mr. Gray from Nebraska right after the INC meeting, so approximately two weeks ago. And there's a state coordinating group meeting scheduled for this Thursday, and I will be providing the demonstration this Thursday to the state coordinating group of both, what we call the NARUC, N-A-R-U-C, Special Data Product, which is available for download and the (indiscernible) on line.

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: Okay. Thank you. Thanks for that.

MR. HAVENS: Don?

MR. GRAY: Don Gray, Nebraska Public Service Commission. I'd just like to note also that as we've worked through this issue, Nebraska originally was one of the states that was in opposition to removal of the (indiscernible) because we didn't make use

of it as other states do when we're analyzing resource assignments. But Adam Newman from Telcordia provided access to that database. I think it was late '05, early '06 when we first had some information available as here's what we could do. And since that became available, that's what Nebraska has shifted over and used because it's no older than a month, it's accurate, it's what actually routes the codes, as opposed to what got filed and may or may not be accurate. So Thursday afternoon we're going to have a demonstration, a presentation, if you will, for the states coordinating group so that folks can see what the tool is, how they can use it, and see if we can break this logjam.

MR. NEWMAN: Again, Adam Newman, Telcordia Technologies. And one of the reasons that we're also demonstrating the LERG on-line version is because that's actually updated from the database on a daily basis. So in case there were any state commissions that were really interested in daily updated data, the LERG online provides that capability.

MS. HAVENS: Thank you. And I again like to note we appreciate Telcordia's cooperation on that because, I mean, this is their own product that they're making available to state commissioners. And I think that's laudable and should be recognized.

John?

MR. MANNING: Yes. John Manning, NANPA. I just wanted to make one clarification in terms of what NANPA provides today. There are numerous states today that receive daily Part 1 reports, which is a listing of all Part 1s, CO code applications, received by NANPA for a particular state and their associated area codes. That information, when submitted into NAS by the service provider or NANPA on behalf of the service provider as it comes through the PA, is available to the state at that particular moment that it's entered into the system, so that states that get this daily Part 1 report are

getting the information before NANPA has acted upon it. I wanted to make sure that was clear because in a number of instances, states have come back to NANPA when receiving that information, requested additional information, and some additional follow-up before a code has actually been assigned or, in some instances, before the code is assigned direction provided based upon the information in the Part 1. So I wanted to make sure it was clear in terms of what states are receiving today, those that have opted in to receive the daily Part 1 reports. Thank you.

MR. HAVENS: Thanks, John.

Slide 6, please? Slide 6 talks about Issue 506. 506 was an issue where, that was brought into the INC on behalf of the LNP working group to make changes to the Thousands, the TBPAG and the Appendix 2 Thousands-Block donation form. This change is requested due to carriers donating contaminated blocks prior to completed intra-service provider reports on unavailable numbers. The reason, what we had hoped to accomplish by working this issue was to stress to service providers how important it was for them to complete their intra-service provider reports. Basically on this form we ask a series of new questions of the service provider, such as: is the block contaminated, how many TNs are unavailable for assignment, are your ISPs complete. In other words, we're trying to, in flashing red lines, make sure that service providers are aware of their obligations when it comes to donating blocks, and that they perform all of their duties. And so changes were made to that form.

And one last point, by virtue of completing this form the service provider is in effect certifying that all the information is complete and accurate, that they've done due diligence in completing, that type of information. This issue was assigned to Change Order 51, and those changes will not go into effect until after the PA Change Order is

approved by the FCC. Any questions on that issue?

Slide 7, please. Slide 7 deals with issue 407, which is the treatment of dedicated codes for single customers in a pooling environment. I believe this issue was visited at the November 30 NANC meeting last year. And the INC took an action item away from that to come back to the NANC to, if possible, provide some quantitative information regarding this information, or regarding this issue more information than had been provided previously.

And so this slide talks a little bit about, you know, about the issue itself, why it was required. It actually allows a service provider to request a code for a dedicated customer directly from NANPA and the pooling area, significantly increasing the efficiency of attaining resources for a large enterprise. The issue is then in effect a process-improvement issue that seeks to remove the PA from the process of the service provider getting the code. They want to be able to go directly to NANPA when requesting a dedicated code in a pooling environment for a large single customer.

The quantitative information that we bring to the table today is that we noted from, and this was taken from a PA report, that over the past three years an annual average of 135 dedicated code requests had been processed in pooling areas. The INC believes this to be a significant number of codes requested for dedicated codes. And one of the points we note here is that with the current process, taking into account the safety-valve process that a service provider typically has to go through, because quite often they don't meet utilization or (indiscernible) exhaust, and so they have to go the safety-valve route to request this code, basically elongates the timeframe for which they have to get numbers to this customer.

The third point is that these are large customers and represent significant revenue

to the customer. So to the extent that it takes a long time to get numbers for these customers, often times the customer will seek out an alternative service provider because the one service provider to whom they went to cannot fill the request in what they perceive to be a timely manner.

So you may recall that when the INC brought this to the NANC, the NANC formed an IMG to also look at this issue. And they agreed completely with the INC that this was a good process improvement opportunity, and (indiscernible) need to take another look at this.

So, Mr. Chairman, that's where we are on this issue.

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: Does INC have any plans to do direct follow-up with the FCC on this issue?

MR. HAVENS: It's under consideration. We haven't made any decisions at this point.

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: Okay.

MR. HAVENS: Are there any questions?

Slide 8 represents two issues that the INC has worked and completed that require the INC to request from the NAPM LLC permission for the PA to request of the impacts and reports for ported information. This information on ported numbers for blocks that have been abandoned or blocks that are being returned allow the PA to review, to look at those blocks, to see whether or not they're over contaminated, more than 10% contaminated, and again going back to the ISPP portion essentially to make sure that they're ready to be donated or made available to the pool. So we issued that letter and hope to hear from the NAPM LLC as to whether or not those requests have been approved.

Any questions?

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: Actually on that, when were those letters sent, or that letter sent?

MR. HAVENS: Just this week, maybe --

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: Yesterday it went out and we're expecting (indiscernible) back by (indiscernible).

MR. HAVENS: Through the microphone I'm going to introduce you for the record.

MR. DECKER: Tim Decker, Verizon for the NAPM LLC. I was in receipt of that letter this morning, and we will try to get it on our agenda at this month's meeting.

MR. HAVENS: Thank you very much. Okay.

Slide 9 represents issue 510 which is the internet-based relay services and interoperability. The contributions for the INC VRS report, we received a number of those at our December and January INC meeting. At this time we want to make note that the report is in development for the NANC, and that with respect to this report we've created a shell for that report and have a number of contributions that have been submitted against that. The VRS, we created what we call a contribution development subteam for the INC, and they've been meeting on nearly a weekly basis trying to develop contributions to flesh out this report. And as of the last INC, it was noted that the INC is in hopes of having something completed or something to present to the NANC by June.

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: By June? Okay.

MR. HAVENS: Yes. That's the plan at this particular point. And at the next INC meeting we anticipate that we would be sending out for comment our report. Any

questions, concerns that we have with regard to, for example, 911 (indiscernible) or maybe interoperability concerns to (indiscernible), so we anticipate doing that very soon.

Any questions?

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: And I just think this will probably come up, but you received from the LNP working group?

MR. HAVENS: That's correct, with regard to impact as a possible solution.

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: Okay. I know that was one thing that we talked about last time, and I'm glad to see that the working group (indiscernible).

MR. HAVENS: It was reviewed by the INC at the last meeting among other possibilities.

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: Okay. Thank you.

MR. HAVENS: Sure.

Slide 10 and 11, I won't go into those, but for slide 10 these are issues that remain in initial pending. And this represents that INC is either waiting implementation of approved change orders, or is awaiting FCC action on a particular change order. So those issues are at this point in what INC calls initial pending.

And on slide 11, this represents the issues that went into final closure since the last NANC meeting. Any questions? Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN: All right. Thank you, Ken.

Even though we skipped the break, we're basically pretty much on schedule. I'd like to actually kind of keep us, given the snow and the weather and everything, I'd kind of like to keep us going. Unless somebody really feels we need to take a break, I'd rather just go to lunch and then see how much we can get done just so, you know, we have a snowball's chance of getting out of here.

Okay. So the Billing and Collection agent (indiscernible) I think is the next report.

Report from the North American Number Plan

Billing and Collection (NANP B&C) Agent

MS. MARCOTTE: Good morning. This is Faith Marcotte with the Billing and Collection Agent, Welch and Company. So there are two reports today. The first one is the regular NANC report that we do for the month of January '07. Page 1 shows the financial position of the fund which, at this point at the end of January was at 3.5 million. That's comprised of mostly cash of 4.8 million, less accrued liabilities of 1.5 million. Those accrued liabilities are listed below, the bulk of it which is to NEUSTAR just not getting approved invoices yet to pay. The fund itself is earning in, the Dreyfus Government Cash Management Fund is earning about 4.42% annually.

If you go to the next page it shows where we're projecting the fund to be at June '07 -- well, projected for the next year, but particularly June '07. That's in the shaded columns. We see a total column and a budget column, and then the difference between the two, an analysis of the differences. So if you look in the difference column, you can see that they're not that different other than for pooling, which is about a million off, which is lower. So our pooling is lower than we had anticipated when we did the budget. And also our forecast was slightly off if you look at the 478 below. So overall, we're projecting a surplus of 1.5 million, which is made up of the million in the contingency fund that we set aside and then the 576,000 that, the differences between the budget and the total that we are expecting at the end of June. In the square box you'll see the details of that reconciliation if you want to look that over.

And then the next page is a forecast of what we expect we'll be paying out over

the next six months, up to August '07.

Does anyone have any questions? Okay.

So the next report is titled NANP fund budget and contribution factor for July '07 to June 2008.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Just to -- the presentation that Faith just gave is Exhibit 7, just the one with the Welch and Company letterhead. The other document, which will be Exhibit 8, is the net fund, NANP fund budget and contribution factor. Go ahead.

MS. MARCOTTE: All right. So the first two pages are commentary, but the budget itself, the projected disbursements are on the third page of that report, if we can turn to that. So first we start out with NANP admin and that's based on a fixed contract that there is with the admin. So there's nothing to be a surprise there. Of that 1.54 million, 85,000 will be paid by Canada and the Caribbean countries. That leaves the cost to be covered at 1.365 million for NANP admin. The next number is pooling. Right now it's highlighted because that is not a final number yet. We're just estimating right now. That 4.1 million is based on -- right now pooling can bill 296,000 maximum a month. So that adds up to about 3½ million, and then they have a couple of change orders, 48 and 51, which might be another 500,000. So that's where we get the 4 million 1 hundred.

As Amy mentioned before, their contract can be extended right now until April 14th. We're hoping that there will be a contract in place before the end of April. Then we can incorporate this fixed-price contract into the budget, which will give us a more accurate number since we are just totally estimating at this point.

The other thing we are looking at when we discussed it with the working group is going back to look at what the actual costs for pooling was versus what the maximum they are allowed to go, because as you saw from the previous report it was about a

million less last year. So instead of being overly conservative and basing it on the maximum, we're going to try to maybe get a better, a more accurate picture of what that number could be. But the best scenario would be if we had the contract in place by that date. So that's what we're hoping for, but we are still looking at this number and we will continue to do that with the working group. And hopefully by, well, maybe by the next NANC meeting we'll have a better number there. We'll let you know.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS. MARCOTTE: The next number is a pANI number. That again is an estimate. We know that this will be combined with the pooling contract when that contract is signed, so we'll move that number out should that contract be awarded in time. The carrier audits number of 700,000, that's a number that the FCC has suggested we use so we are using it.

CHAIRMAN: Faith, I've got a quick question. Sorry. I didn't follow my own rule. The pANI administration (indiscernible), change order 51 is for the interim pANI administration, correct? So this is 150,000 budgeted for permanent administration? Is that --

MS. MARCOTTE: That was an original number that Amy had put out might be the cost before pooling started doing it. So that's the number we're using.

CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MS. MARCOTTE: But that's only because we don't have a better number to use.

CHAIRMAN: I just wanted to make sure we're not double counting, because I think we have the -- this goes back to the question that we had for Amy about that change order hasn't been completed yet and is currently in negotiation.

MS. MARCOTTE: Well, we'll talk to Amy before we finalize this to make sure

we're not double counting.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thanks.

MS. MARCOTTE: The Billing Collection Agent, which is us, is a fixed-price contract. The data collection agent of 56,000, that is USAC. And that's an estimate but it's what they have estimated the cost will be. The annual operations audit is an external audit of us that has yet to be done, but that's what we anticipate the cost to be. The interest income is based on previous experience. The late filing fee, it's a new number because we've been tracking that number. And that's when the companies file their forms late, they get charged \$100. And it adds up to \$115,000. So we're now incorporating that into the budget.

So the projected disbursements are 6.3 million. We've left a million in contingency for unforeseen events. That means we have to fund 7.3 million.

If you look in the comparative column for last year, the contribution factor was 000021. And if you look to the next page, we've got the funding options for this, the next year. Option 1, we are looking at a factor of 246 versus the 21, or 2-10 of last year. That's using up the full surplus that we anticipate at the end of June, which comes from the previous report of 1.5 million. And that will bring the surplus to zero, other than the million contingency.

Option 2 would be a factor of 2-5-0. That's a number that had been projected a couple of years ago to keep the fund, the contribution factor steady so companies know what they're going to be paying. So we've incorporated that as an option. That would leave a surplus of 95,000 carry forward.

And Option 3 is not to use the surplus, just carry that forward. And that would produce a factor of 3-1-3. So what we have to decide is which factor we're going to use,

which approach we're going to go (indiscernible).

CHAIRMAN: Anna has a question.

MS. MILLER: Anna Miller with T-Mobile. I just have a question for clarification. In the Option 1 that's listed here, we're utilizing the \$1.15 million surplus from the past year, but there still is the \$1 million contingency in there. Is that correct?

MS. MARCOTTE: That's right.

MS. MILLER: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: So it's in essence taking the additional 576. That's how that kind of works.

MS. MILLER: Right, but there's still a million dollar contingency.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. So at the end of next year there'll be another million hopefully.

MS. MARCOTTE: The revenue numbers, we're basing these factors on a 1% growth in revenue, which is what the contribution factor is multiplied by to get the bills. By the end of April we will have the exact or pretty close number from the data collection agent. And that will be incorporated into this report when we have the more accurate number.

Are there any questions?

CHAIRMAN: Rosemary?

MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer of Sprint Nextel. I just wanted to make the NANC aware that Tim Decker with Verizon and I co-chair the group that oversees this. And when we decided earlier in January to put the timeline together as to what we're looking at for the budget and contribution factor and things for the group, to manage the group, we slated based on years previously at the beginning of March to receive the

proposed contribution factor information from Welch. And I just wanted to make everyone aware that they sent the proposed contribution factor information to us at the end of January. So they were way ahead of schedule. Thank you very much.

MS. MARCOTTE: Thank you. No further questions?

CHAIRMAN: Phil Jones of Washington.

COMMISSIONER JONES: Commissioner Jones, Washington State. Could you just go back to Exhibit 7 and, just a point of confirmation. This makeup of accrued liabilities where it states the liabilities, how does that correlate to Exhibit 8 budget for '06/'07 and '07/'08? I'm particularly interested in NEUSTAR's expenses. There's \$957,000 for the Thousands Block Pooling. And their admin expenses are 237,000. So what's the basis of those accrued liabilities in relation to the budget that you just went over?

MS. MARCOTTE: They're incorporated in what our surplus number will be at the end of June so that we are including the potential, what we know are going to be expenses to the end of June. And those numbers are in there so that we have an accurate fund balance, surplus balance to incorporate into the choice we make for the funding factor.

CHAIRMAN: Any further questions? And I guess the Working Group is next, right, so we can somewhat continue the same discussion. Thank you, Faith. Looking inside the report of the Billing and Collection Working Group, which is Rosemary Emmer and Tim Decker. They have a presentation which will be Exhibit 9.

Report of the Billing and Collection Working Group (B&C WG)

MS. EMMER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Rosemary Emmer, Sprint Nextel. And I'd like to introduce the new co-chair, Tim Decker of Verizon. I won't have to

repeat the contribution factor proposal. Faith did a great job going over it, and I believe that all the questions were answered.

Page 2 of our report which is the submission statement and the area of responsibility was reviewed with you the last time. So I won't go over that again. But our current activities on the next page, we're putting together at this point, part of 2005 and all of 2006 performance review. This is the first time this group has put this together, and we are working through right now what the ratings should look like, whether it should be, for instance, not met, met, more than met, exceeds similar to how the NOWG rates, or whether it should be something different. And we've also put together a draft matrix, if you will, based on the deliverable documents or deliverables that we capture every other month from Welch and Company. As far as a timeline when we'll have this performance review completed, we don't have one at this point. We aren't aware that the NANC has any deadlines for us, and if you do please let us know. This is a long process when you're putting a brand new performance review together. So we will just continue to keep you posted. And if there comes a point in time when the FCC or the NANC would like to give us a deadline, we'll be more than happy to accommodate that.

As Faith has gone over previously, the budget and contribution factor are the other two things we're working on right now.

CHAIRMAN: And can you give us an indication of just the timeline of the schedule on the contribution factor approval process so we can get some understanding here? Because the question I had is that we have a couple open questions on it, particularly the PA contract renewal which may change the pricing there.

MS. EMMER: Sure.

CHAIRMAN: And I want to make sure that we have, or at least a public record

understanding as to what, you know, how the normal timeline would be and how that would possibly change, depending on a final or a different PA contract.

MS. EMMER: Well, if you look at page 8 of the presentation, that's our meeting schedule that has our proposed agenda. Clearly we're going to have to kind of touch and feel our way through this. Anything that we're working on right now might not be able to be in stone as a result of what you were just talking about. It looks at this point in time like we would like to finalize this by April 10th.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. So that would be -- and then I guess the PA contract is currently under two monthly extensions, so that's February 14th, March 14th I think was the last date for that. Okay. Thank you.

MS. EMMER: Yes. So if you skip over to page 6, that also lists the current proposed three options for the contribution factor that Faith has just gone over. And I just wanted everyone to know that they did provide that information to the industry, that the entity working group has had a conference call regarding this. And the carriers at this point or the members of that group currently are taking this back internally and trying to come up with an industry position. So if you haven't heard about this already, you probably will hear about this in the next couple of weeks.

The B&C Working Group membership list hasn't changed. And we've listed the carriers that are members for you, as well as our future meeting dates. I did not provide conference bridge information here. If anyone would like to join our group, we would love to have any attendance that we could get. So please feel free to contact Tim or I if you would like to join our cause.

Are there any questions? Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Rosemary.

Again, in the interest of trying to move these things, I think we have the NOWG and then I think we'll probably just break after that.

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: (Indiscernible.)

CHAIRMAN: It's possibly true, yes. I do have a couple of things in the afternoon that I don't think we can completely go through. This is the Numbering Oversight Working Group presentation.

Report of the Numbering Oversight Working Group (NOWG)

MS. MCNAMER: Well, good morning. I'm Natalie McNamer of T-Mobile. I'm one of the co-chairs of the Numbering Oversight Working Group. What we're going to cover today is the NANPA and PA 2006 performance surveys, the evaluation timelines, NANPA and PA change orders, the NEUSTAR acquisition of Followap, Inc., and the NOWG meeting schedule.

On page 3 of the presentation we reviewed that we had the administrators send the surveys out on January 2nd with reminder notices sent in the beginning of February. We have set the due date for the surveys to be February 28th, but in most years we've extended that. So the NOWG is looking to extend that to March 14th. Surveys received as of through yesterday morning was for NANPA, 18 total surveys have been received, seven service providers only, and 11 regulators. On the PA, we've received a better response. There have been 51 total surveys received, 39 service providers and 12 from regulators. So we're hoping to get those numbers up, especially for the NANPA a lot higher before the end of the survey period. We will probably have the administrators also send the extension with another reminder out in the beginning of March.

The proposed schedule that we're going off of for the performance evaluations is the new date of March 14th. Then we will be going to Concord to the PA offices on

March 26th through 28th for the operational review. April 11th and 12, the NANPA operations review in Sterling; then in May we meet in Denver for two to three days to actually put together all of the performance reports. Some time in June we'll be asking to meet with the FCC to review the draft report to be presented at the NANC meeting.

(END OF AUDIOTAPE 1, SIDE 2)

* * * * *

(START OF AUDIOTAPE 2, SIDE 1)

MS. MCNAMER: I think we have about two meetings.

Next, is a couple of change orders we had for NANPA which I believe John has already reviewed in detail. The NOWG did analyze change orders 8 and 9 and recommended to the FCC that they be approved. Subsequently they have been approved by the FCC.

The PA had three change orders, two of which -- PA Change Order 49 and 50 -- were analyzed and recommended for approval to the FCC, and subsequently approved already. Change Order 51, the NOWG has reviewed it and will be recommending that the FCC approve it. That should be going out sometime this week.

Slide 10 is in respect to the acquisition of Followap, Inc. by NEUSTAR. This was an action item that was given to the NOWG at the last NANC meeting.

So based on our review, the NOWG doesn't find any issues at this time, but we wanted to review with the NANC what exactly the NOWG does to come to that conclusion. Our basis for the evaluation on slide number 11 shows the original neutrality requirements that were placed on NEUSTAR at its creation and the safe harbor neutrality requirements. The evaluation process is that select members of the NOWG review quite a few different things: the products and services, technologies and platforms, affiliations

with other companies, corporate structure management, competitors' and customers' target market for the, for Followap is what they did. Most of this is done via website searches. Then select members also review publicly available information on Followap, including their financial statements, reviews, and press.

So the NOWG did complete that process and does not find any issues, but the NOWG would like the NANC to consider engaging a legal group or an IMG in any future structural changes within NEUSTAR. Also we wanted to point out that it may be possible for these type of neutrality issues to be identified in the neutrality audits, but the NOWG does not have enough information on those audits to know if that would be the case or not. So we just wanted to have that pointed out.

The last page of the presentation is just the meeting schedule coming up for the NOWG.

CHAIRMAN: Questions? Anna?

MS. MILLER: Anna Miller, T-Mobile. Just to follow up on the NOWG's request, I guess you're asking the NANC to consider whether or not you need to have a legal working group. And I guess the question is are the existing neutrality audits sufficient, or does there need to be a legal group to consider future structural changes? And I think this is really focused with regard to neutrality. And in the past, I think when we were initially trying to define neutrality, and the NANC was addressing that issue, and I don't remember how long ago that was, but --

CHAIRMAN: Very long.

MS. MILLER: Very long. I'm probably the only one that was here at the time. Or maybe Ray was here. But in order to actually come up with a definition of neutrality from a legal perspective, we created this legal working group. And that's how we

developed the neutrality requirements. So again, I think maybe it's something for this group to consider whether or not that's needed, or are the neutrality audits sufficient. Because I think a lot of the consideration that goes into that evaluation is more legal than technical member administration.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Understood. And so that the idea is that there is different fields of expertise, in essence, involved? Does that summarize the statements, that there may be a different level of knowledge required to engage in that review to the extent one is seen necessary?

MS. MILLER: Right.

CHAIRMAN: I'm trying to characterize what you said.

MS. MILLER: Yes, I guess you know the degree of comfort. If the NANC believes that these neutrality audits are sufficient, that's fine. If we believe that there needs to be further consideration, then I think it may be beneficial to form a legal group to look at that since it was a legal group from the NANC that actually developed those neutrality requirements. Or, I guess what I'm saying is, do we need that legal perspective versus having a working group that's focused really on the technical member administration requirements.

CHAIRMAN: Certainly. Rosemary?

MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint Nextel. Along those lines I wanted to point out that this is the first time that I can recall any member of the NOWG choosing to abstain from conducting census process. And I believe that happened in this particular situation when we went to get consensus on this or when we discussed it. And the reason why that rather large company chose to abstain was because they felt that this was outside of their realm of NOWG actually going up that particular person's chain of

command. There wasn't anyone other than going into the regulatory arena that was able to provide guidance, so they chose to abstain. And I'm not sure if that would happen in the future or not, but certainly if there was a legal group or a legal IMG that was looking at this type of request, we might not have folks abstaining from making decisions going forward. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Appreciate it. Are there other -- Hank?

MR. HOLCUST: Hank Hultquist, AT&T. I think that these are really good points. I think the thing we have to be careful of ultimately is that NANC's job is to advise the FCC on certain matters. And the more purely legal matters, you know, a particular question is, the less the FCC, an agency which employs hundreds of lawyers, needs the advice of the members of the NANC on a purely legal question. So I think that would be the cautionary note I would say, and to the extent there is such a group formed in the future that it really be very narrowly focused on more issue spotting than reaching a legal resolution.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Okay. Do you still have something? This is, I actually tend to agree with what Hank was just talking about in terms of just -- first of all, there's no acquisition on the table, so this is a bit of a hypothetical discussion in one sense. But I see a NANC role in this as at most being a fact-finding type role. And, you know, in the rules on this, the ultimate decision maker on neutrality is the Federal Communications Commission. So I'm not sure that even if we did create a specialized group we'd call it a legal group. I mean, I think that it would be perhaps driven more specifically by a particular transaction that the particular working group may feel that their members may not happen to be involved. So I'm not sure it's necessary to create a new standing committee or a new standing working group on this. I think that the points driven by the

members of the NOWG -- and I do understand that their participation in that working group is a certain level of expertise in the industry. So I do understand that there may not be a complete coincident. My original thought on this is that it was the Numbering Oversight Working Group, and so I thought the broad word oversight was sufficient.

With regard to the neutrality audits and the sufficiency of those, I would just like to point out that I received earlier this week or late last week the latest neutrality audit from NEUSTAR. And that is something that I think we probably should start putting into the official documents of NANC to a certain extent, somewhere on the web, just the results of those as those are transmitted to me. And so this latest audit didn't find any problems, and it predated the most recent acquisition.

Is there any further discussion on this? I'm just trying to get -- like I said, I think this is more of a fact finding to the extent that we do work on these questions as fact finding, not legal conclusions. If there is appetite to looking at, you know, the content of neutrality audits or the neutrality standards, I'm more than open to having somebody suggest that. But I haven't really had anybody come up to me and say, this neutrality standard is incorrect, you know, should be changed based on what we've learned in the last seven years. That hasn't happened to me, so I don't see any reason to really bring that forward at any point in time.

Is there anything further on this? Okay. Well, I appreciate the work that was done on this by the working group.

Okay. There are a couple of moving parts in the afternoon in terms of, particularly a discussion on Local Number Portability that some other people had told me they wanted to participate in. So I'm trying to move our schedule as fast as possible. And I also want to be mindful that we have other people that want to be here for

particular discussions. So what I'm going to propose we do now, it's a little bit early, but suggest that we break for lunch now and we come back here at 12:30. If that works, that lets people do a little bit of work and phone calls. And then we'd pick up the agenda basically right there. And I think if we stay on that, we'll probably be done a half hour early, maybe even a little bit earlier than normal. You know, I'd like to plow through as much as possible, but I also do want to make sure that we have sufficient time for people that expressed wanting to participate in something. And I want to make sure that we are here at the time that we said. And I'm going to try and track them down and get them here earlier anyway. So if that makes sense to anybody, we'll go make snowballs in the courtyard and have a lot of fun. So I'll see everyone in an hour.

(LUNCH RECESS.)

CHAIRMAN: All right. We are largely back. Okay. We're going to plow through the afternoon agenda, just going to kind of plow through it without the break because flights are getting canceled left and right. I think we'll start with the pANI IMG report, Don Gray, Nebraska, who has a presentation that we'll call Exhibit 10.

MS. BLUE: Eleven.

CHAIRMAN: Eleven? Okay. Thanks.

Reports from the pANI Issues Management Group (IMGs)

MR. GRAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This report is in response to a question that was raised at our November 30th meeting having to do with the interim pANI. The question was what's the difference between an Emergency Services Query Key, and ESQK, an Emergency Services Routing Key, an ESRK. On page 2 there you will see a test of acronyms. And I'm not going to attempt to read the whole thing through, but bottom line is the ESQK is a routing methodology that is used by voice-over IP service

providers to provide appropriate information for the public service answering point when a call has been placed by that voice-over IP customer. And ESRK is a routing key that is used by a wireless carrier to provide appropriate information to the public service answering point when a wireless customer places a call to a public service answering point.

So there is a difference between technically what the two keys are, but there is no difference in their basic usage, which is to associate a caller with a record of information or a PSAP. And there is no difference in that they both use a ten-digit number. Can be a dialable, can be a non-dialable number. So unless anyone has any specific questions there, that's the answer to the question that was asked last meeting, what's the difference between the two.

On the next slide, just to recount some of the information that Amy Putnam provided to us this morning, five applicants for interim RNA status, one rejected so there's only four approved registrations at this time. No applications, one received, one denied. So updating that from Amy's presentation this morning.

The concerns that the pANI IMG have talked, discussed through, and would simply like to present to the NANC as points of information for them are that the interim RNA is not gaining real-world experience that the IMG had anticipated might be available to it when we were first developing the plan, and that without that real-world experience there isn't a good way to validate the process flows they developed or validate the mechanisms that they have developed. They will and they'll make it work. We have confidence in that. It's just, what's the learning curve going to be when the permanent RNA opens shop and now the wireless industry is presenting itself in full force.

The second point is that wireless carriers predominantly in areas where there is

not a volunteer numbering administrator, such as an incumbent carrier that has traditionally assigned pANIs out of non-dialable resources, the wireless carrier has to use their own dialable resources, or they have to go to an aggregator to use resources. The concern here is that it is a resource that's being used that most likely from the people we have talked to, from the people that have commented in the IMG, that once a carrier assigns a group of pANIs to a public service answering point, got them all set up on the appropriate selective router and the other things that they have to do, there's very low probability that at a point in the future they're going to go back and put true pANIs in place and reassociate the numbers for two reasons. There's a cost involved, and you have to test that PSAP database, the routing of it, and that requires for some finite period of time that that database may be off line or may not be able to properly process a call. So there's been the safety issue concern that's raised. And I think I'll leave it at that.

Martin, I see you have a question.

MR. HAKIM DIN: Yes. Martin Hakim Din with Vonage. Just to clarify something that Don said correctly, the cost associated with re-provisioning an ESRK is also on the side of the public safety outfit. So the PSAP will have to pay typically one of their network service providers to retest. So it's not a question of the wireless carriers complaining about having to pay to retest. It's really I think more of a burden on the public safety entity, having to go back and spend resources to retest.

MR. GRAY: Anna?

MS. MILLER: Anna Miller with T-Mobile. When we were discussing this, these concerns internally at T-Mobile, we were trying to determine kind of how big of an issue is this for us. And if, from our perspective I think the crucial element here is time. So if, you know, if it turns out -- it was very good news today that the INC has been working

very hard and that they're on schedule for coming up with their guidelines in March. So, that's very good news.

So to the extent that we have a mechanism for permanent pANI administration in the second half of this year, I think that our concerns here on the impact are minimized. But if we're sitting here same time next year with the same concerns, then I think that we've maybe lost an opportunity to save some telephone numbering resources. I know that it is very difficult for a carrier to go in at any point in time and say, okay, you know, these are the dialable resources that we have, these are the 211 resources that we have, this is the 501 resources that we have. That's a very cumbersome exercise, and of course we want to make sure that that information is accurate so we don't have any call interruption risks.

So I just wanted to put that in perspective, and I think the critical issue here is timing. The longer this goes on without access to the (indiscernible), the more, I think, the bigger the issue -- you know, it may go from a breadbox to a battleship. So because of kind of a difficulty in the transition and of resources, and even identifying what resources you have at any given point in time.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: I'd just like to recap a little bit about -- for those who may not remember from the last meeting why the request was made about ESQs and ESRs. And this is just related to the interim pANI Numbering Administration or administrator. And to the extent that they were essentially charged with processing numbers for (indiscernible) providers as a supplemental source of pANIs, it was not intended to displace any private provider. And I think that Anna had it correctly that I think this is -- I view this as a large -- I think it's a transition issue to a certain extent to how do we

bridge a gap from the current situation today to the permanent pANI Administration which, you know, people are very diligently working on to try and get that recommendation to the FCC by the spring time. And I'm really glad that the IMG has looked at this issue and tried to explore what the kind of burdens would be in transitioning.

It's understanding that if you have a dialable resource that you're using as a pANI and want to move that to an administered non-dialable resource, that there are costs involved like Martin said. And I think that's important to understand that, particularly as we examine transition rules because I think that's one thing that we're going to probably be talking about a lot at the next meeting, is okay, to what extent are we going to move from the current system to the new system. You know, to what extent are we going to require carriers to stop using dialable resources, how much lead time are we going to give them to give those numbers back, what kind of notice is going to be involved. I think all of those are kind of the next-step questions. The sooner I think we get to work on putting in the permanent administration, I hope we can keep this current issue to a breadbasket size. But I think it is useful that we kind of keep our eyes open for it and do understand that these resources are being consumed today from dialable resources.

Is there further discussion on that? I'm glad that they picked this up and have provided the information that we asked. Thanks, Don.

Okay. The next one is the LNPA Working Group. And Tom Navin, Chief of the Wireline Competition Bureau has joined us. Thanks, Gary. This is Exhibit 12, the LNPA Working Group Status Report.

Local Number Portability Administration (LNPA) Working Group

MR. SACRA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Gary Sacra, Local Number Portability Administration Working Group Co-chair. Good afternoon, everyone. The Working Group has one item to report on today. And first, I'd like to apologize on behalf of the Working Group for the lateness in getting report out last night. It just so happened we had our February conference call scheduled for yesterday and we didn't finish up until late in the afternoon. So hopefully in the future we will have these reports out to you in a much more timely fashion. So again, for those that have not had a chance to review this report, I will try to go through it in enough detail for you.

The item I will be reporting on today is the position paper that was presented to the council members at the November 2006 NANC meeting. And it addresses porting obligations. The action item that was directed to the working group was to revise the position paper. There was a very understandable concern that the original position paper was too focused on one particular type of provider. So even though the original issue that was presented at the Working Group was related to a particular type of provider, the action item was to revise the position of the Working Group to refocus it in a more general sense, and not so narrowly focused on one particular type of provider.

So the Working Group on our call yesterday agreed upon revised text. And I'll sort of walk you through the position paper on the second page of the report. And again, this particular issue is related to providers that rely upon an underlying network provider or wholesale network provider to obtain numbering resources in order to assign them to their customers and provide service to their customers. The issue that a number of providers that the LNPA Working Group articulated was in some cases, and still in cases today, it has been difficult, in some cases impossible, to accommodate customers of these

providers who want to put the numbers into these particular providers that were raising the issue at the Working Group. So this position paper is an attempt to not only articulate the issue, make the NANC and the FCC aware of the issue, but to also present the position of the Working Group that we reached consensus upon, and also to make the NANC and the FCC aware that we are ready to revise the NANC flows, however appropriate, in order to make them consistent with this position I'm going to walk through.

The first paragraph in the position paper is some relevant sights that indicate to the Working Group that the FCC does recognize that Local Number Portability is an evolving process. As new technologies are introduced, it's very likely that the process, the NANC LNP flows could likely require updating in order to accommodate the evolution that Local Number Portability still continues to occur. So these are the relevant sights that we believe indicated that to the Working Group.

The next paragraph, the second paragraph is a restatement of the original issue. A number of the providers that raised the issue in the Working Group are identified here in this paragraph. And again, even though the original issue was focused on one particular type of provider, in general though the difficulty is in the case where some types of providers such as resellers, such as type 1 cellular providers, voice-over IP providers, those are examples of the types of providers that do partner with wholesale network providers in order to obtain their numbering resources for assignment to those customers. And the complexity there is it adds another layer of communication onto the porting process that in some cases has made it difficult or impossible to accommodate requesting customers who want to port their numbers. So the second paragraph is a restatement of that issue.

The third paragraph here is just to detail an analogous situation that the Working Group went through back in 2003 when we revised the NANC LNP flows to address cases such as a I just discussed. And that's where providers are partnering with underlying network providers to obtain their numbering resources. What we did back in 2003 was revise the NANC flows to incorporate the steps necessary to accommodate porting numbers when the customer, their local service provider is a reseller or a type 1 cellular provider. However, the numbers that are assigned to them have been obtained from an underlying network wholesale provider.

So we added additional steps, additional flows to develop the communication process that had to take place between all of those providers in order to port customers who wish to do so. And in both of those cases, and why we think it's analogous to the issues that we're experiencing today, in both of those cases of resellers and type 1 cellular providers, the flows were updated to reflect that it's the underlying network provider that's responsible for accepting and responding to a local service request in order to port a customer, whose number has been obtained from that network provider, or if the customer has a billing arrangement, or their local service provider happens to be either a reseller or a type 1 provider.

So the last section on the second page of the position paper is to express the position of the Working Group, that we believe that the FCC has made it clear that local exchange carriers and CMRS providers are obligated to port local telephone numbers to other carriers at the request of customers, provided they had not been granted a particular exemption. And we believe that it's the obligation of the underlying network provider in the case where providers such as reseller, type 1 cellular providers, Voice-over IP (VoIP) providers have partnered with the underlying network provider to obtain their number

resources. We believe consistent with the current state of the NANC flows that addresses resellers and type 1 cellular, we believe it is the obligation of the underlying network provider within the constraints of FCC requirements and mandates to respond to local service requests and to port the telephone number of a customer who requests to do so.

So the final paragraph in submitting the position paper, the Working Group's goal is to make the NANC and the FCC aware that this is still, you know, has been an ongoing issue, is an ongoing issue. And we do believe that the flows can or should be updated to reflect the latest technologies, the fact that there are other providers in addition to resellers and type 1 cellular providers that partner with underlying network providers to obtain the numbering resources. We believe even with the newer technologies, the same process flows are analogous to those. And we stand ready at the direction of the NANC and/or the FCC to update those flows as appropriate to make them consistent with this position.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you, Gary. And we've actually been joined by the Wireline Competition Bureau Chief Tom Navin who actually expressed that he wanted to say a few words on this topic. So I'll turn it over to him.

MR. NAVIN: Thanks, Tom. First I want to thank everybody here for continuing all of your efforts on numbering issues in general. I know that this work is highly technical and it's very demanding. And we at the FCC certainly appreciate all of the efforts of the NANC.

As it related specifically to the Working Group position, there are many issues packed into this statement. And I just want to address one of those issues so that from a timing standpoint, the work of the NANC and the work of the Working Group is consistent with the direction that the Commission is moving in. In particular, I wanted to

address the issue of interconnected VoIP providers providing porting. The Bureau is currently working on an order that will either clarify -- or that the underlying carrier has that obligation, or alternatively impose the obligation through its ancillary jurisdiction under Title 1. But nevertheless I wanted everyone to be aware that the Bureau is indeed working on an order that will impose that porting obligation on VoIP providers. So that's one issue.

The other issue and, I am sure that you're aware of it, but I wanted to emphasize the speed with which the Bureau will address it. That is the issue of porting from wireline carriers to wireless carriers. Sprint and T-Mobile recently filed a petition that is still out for public comment. The Bureau has been instructed to deal with that petition with all due speed, and we intend to do so. So I would ask that any information that the NANC would like to provide the Commission as it relates to the issues addressed in that petition, you do so as soon as possible because we do plan to address it this spring.

That's all that I'm here to address, and just to say thank you, Tom. Appreciate your efforts for leading the group here. And we'll look forward to working with you throughout the year and hopefully we'll be able to come down and spend some time with you at the other meetings this year.

MR. NAVIN: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Thanks, Tom. Thanks for that clarification, that elucidation. I appreciate Tom coming down and talking to us directly because I think that's going to give us some things to kind of chew on and to think about as we move forward.

On this position paper, do people want to -- given what Tom said, what other thoughts do we have? Rosemary?

MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer with Sprint Nextel. I guess as you were saying

earlier, given Mr. Navin's direction that he gave us, would it be appropriate to go ahead and allow the LNP Working Group to work on the flows now, or wait until the order is out that will be coming out I guess as some point soon?

CHAIRMAN: That's a pretty good question.

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: I was going to ask it, too.

CHAIRMAN: Rethinking about what he said again, what he was talking about, the intent, I mean, I believe there's probably utility to working on the process flows. I think there might (indiscernible) certainly work on the process flows to make it clear on the underlying network provider points. Because I believe he was talking in the alternative, that there would essentially be potentially two routes purporting a VoIP number. And actually I think that the general direction of this working paper was that this is not necessarily a VoIP issue. This is actually a wholesale provider, a retail provider issue.

MS. EMMER: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN: And I think that's an important distinction. And so I do think that we should continue to maintain that, just with the possibility that the flows may also need to have this additional step. But that might be an issue for a different, you know, separate and apart from this standpoint. I don't want to take the floor on this. Do we have other thoughts? Hank?

MR. HULTQUIST: Hank Hultquist, AT&T. I think that's right. I mean, it sounds to me based on what Tom was saying that, you know, there could be this backstop in the order saying that there's an obligation both on the wholesale provider and on the interconnected VoIP provider. But I don't think that that legal status will really affect the optimal design of the process flows, because the best way that gets the process to work is

going to be the best way to get the process to work, regardless of sort of these finer points of where certain obligations lie.

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: I totally agree with that. In fact, not having had the opportunity with the Working Group to go through the flows, but it does seem to be quite an apt analogy with the current state of the flows that, with the reseller situation and Type 1 cellular situation to -- at least in some of the discussions we've had in the Working Group, at this point there's no reason to believe that adding an interconnected Voice-over IP provider would be any different in terms of the steps in that analogy. But again we haven't had the opportunity to go through the flows yet. But we might find different after we go, you know, and dig a little bit deeper.

I would like to take this opportunity too to please encourage -- I know Martin's participating in the Working Group which we very much appreciate. We would very much like to have continued and additional participation at the Working Group with the Voice-over IP providers, especially if we're going to dig into the flows.

CHAIRMAN: One thing I would just kind of state in terms of, based on what Tom said in terms of the position, I would maybe entertain a motion for somebody to say that we do insert something in this position paper which kind of indicates that at this time, you know -- I'm looking at the actual position on page 2 where it says, we believe the FCC has made it clear about (indiscernible) providers. Just having an additional few words which might say that at this time, that's what's going to be required, as a statement of fact as of February 13th, 2007. I think that might make sense. I'm really more thinking from it two years, and if people are looking at this process, this document, and then the process flows might have changed slightly differently, based on what the FCC (indiscernible). And I think that probably -- I don't know. What do people think about

that? Does that make sense?

MR. HULTQUIST: Hank Hultquist, AT&T. I think it does, but unfortunately then that makes me think I'm going to want to put a footnote in that statement, because in fact when the FCC granted SBCIS's waiver petition for authority to get numbering resources from the administrators, as part of that the FCC did require SBCIS to provide Local Number Portability.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. HULTQUIST: So you have one case of a VoIP provider that has an obligation to provide LNP. And it's perfectly sensible, because that VoIP provider happens to be able to get resources direct from the administrator, and it has LRNs and it really can provide number portability. So if we're going to say as of now, maybe I'll write a footnote and send it to Gary.

CHAIRMAN: I'm thinking in terms, in general the way I see it is that if we achieve consensus basically around this paragraph or this statement, that I'll be encapsulating that into a letter to the FCC to basically inform them that we've done this. And so I think that would be the appropriate time to put that sentence in. And I think that, to a certain extent, if folks want to tighten that language on this -- that first sentence was really kind of written to say, you know, this is what the rules require, which is quite different than what would have been done as a condition of the granting of a waiver, or something like that. But I think that's probably a very useful thing to say and to make it clear. And I think that probably can be done through a written arrangement, unless people are objecting to doing it that way. I mean, through e-mail exchange, people who want to tighten this up a little bit.

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: I'll be happy to make those changes. I'll work

with you, Hank, and if I can send it to Debbie and then she would get back out to the members. And perhaps we could finalize it via e-mail.

CHAIRMAN: But I think that what we said, at least take from this is that at a minimum we know that an order is in the works to clarify, I think was his word that would clarify the obligations. I believe that what the LNPA working group has been working on over the last several months actually -- I think six to nine months -- has been to, in essence, search out and almost request that clarification. So I think that this is pretty good news from the Commission at this point.

Were there any further thoughts on this document? Given that we're probably going to do a little bit of editorial changes, does anybody else have anything else similar to what Hank was talking about, or ideas that they wish would get on the record right now? Okay. And I do want to -- also based on his statement about the wireless to wireline petition, I do think that -- and that had been in the LNP Working Group -- he essentially invited us to weigh in or make contributions to that proceeding. What I'd kind of like to do is that at least provide the Commission some kind of statement as to what NANC had been doing in the last, I guess since the 2004 report. What was the last time we talked about inter-modal porting intervals? Is that correct? April of 2004, Anna?

MS. MILLER: Anna Miller, T-Mobile. Yes, the NANC Intermodal Porting IMG submitted their report in -- was it May of 2004? Actually I put together some background information on the NANC's activities that started with the wireless/wireline Integration Report. That first report came out in '98. And there were subsequent -- there is a wireless/wireline integration first, second, and third report in '98, '99, and 2000 which resulted in some feedback in November of 2003 from the FCC on focusing on any benefits from shortening the porting interval, which resulted in the Porting Interval IMG.

And then they submitted, I think, their recommendation in May of 2004. But I can provide that background if that would be helpful.

CHAIRMAN: Well, I was actually more directed towards, since May of 2004, because I think that that 2004 report actually is relatively comprehensive on that stuff. And I think that's important, but I think we should, you know, to a certain extent they knew that already. I was thinking in terms of an action item for the -- I don't want to create an IMG on something like this. An action item for the LNPA Working Group would just be to provide the FCC some kind of statement from the NANC or from the Working Group as to what NANC's efforts since May of 2004, since that report, you know, on this question. And I'm not necessarily proposing that -- well, no. I think that that's probably the first thing. I think it's important when the questions as to, you know, whether or not NANC has failed to achieve consensus or has achieved consensus. I think it's important, you know, and that becomes a top (indiscernible). And I think it's important for us when requested by the Bureau to provide them that information, to say okay, here is what we say we've completed and what we haven't completed.

(Indiscernible) about status report? Yes, Rosemary?

MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint Nextel. I just want to make sure that I'm clear, because I'll make sure to go to the LNPA Working Group meeting, as to exactly what the group is looking for. So are you suggesting that we may go through old meeting notes and pull out what we have already on the record for the meeting notes, or are you just talking about high level, what the LNPA working group currently provides to us, the matrix that has the intermodal issues on it? So, I'm a little confused as to how much detail you were looking for and how to go about getting that information, just so that we have clear direction when we get to, I guess it's Denver next month.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, because I guess that would be your target. What I want to do is provide the Bureau or the FCC the information so that when they are considering this issue, they can say okay, this is what the NANC has done since the 2004 report, these are the issues they've considered, these are the issues that haven't been necessarily addressed if that's the case. I guess that's kind of a, almost a reconstruction effort of old minutes. And I think that what I don't want to have happen is it become a rehash, that the process of creating that report become a context for debating the questions. It's almost as a statement to say that we've considered this for a period of time, and this is the issue, and if people want to say what they want to say about it -- and I just think that when people start talking about what was considered at NANC, that NANC had something to say about, these are the issues we considered, these are the ones we resolved, these are the ones we didn't resolve. I don't really want to have an advocacy or an editorial discussion of that. I just think that writing down a summary of what has been done is interesting, is important.

MR. SACRA: Certainly the issues that we've addressed in the context of intermodal porting are readily identifiable.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. You guys do a very good job with issue tracking.

MR. SACRA: And so we can list the issues that we've addressed. We can certainly indicate which ones we've reached consensus on, which ones we've resolved, perhaps a brief statement on what the resolution was. We can also list the ones that we had not reached consensus on. Would you also, or do you think it would be of value to have a brief statement on both sides of the issue? Because obviously a lot of these issues, I mean, there are reasonable positions on both sides of these issues, and they're being debated by reasonable and intelligent people. It may be of value perhaps to have a brief

statement on what the positions are on the --

CHAIRMAN: If the statement of position is a non-controversial item to generate, I would say that that's okay. But I would not want this to get hung up with people saying, you know, taking and using this as another by -- I don't really mean anything. I think that it was pretty clear that they wanted to work on this with dispatch and so --

(END OF AUDIOTAPE 2, SIDE 1)

* * * * *

(START OF AUDIOTAPE 2, SIDE 2)

CHAIRMAN: -- is to get hung up. And my position in 2005 was this. It was like okay, you know, it's 2007. Let's kind of move on. So I would get unnecessarily hung up on that. I really think from their standpoint, and I'm thinking of this as a former Commission staffer, it's actually very useful to have a list of things that have been resolved and things that haven't been resolved. I think that's a very useful item to have as you're putting an order together. And the fact is this group has done a lot and has accomplished a lot in that area, and I think that since they asked for our input we should provide to them. They are the ultimate decision maker on these things, so we're just kind of serving our purpose there. Parties are -- this is not a proceeding where people are going to be silent as on behalf of their companies as to what they think the correct result is. So I don't think the absence of a statement of position from the NANC document will prevent people from stating their position on it.

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: Our next face-to-face meeting is March -- Rosemary, it's the 13th to the 15th, I believe?

MS. EMMER: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: Is that the timeline --

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: -- if we were to complete it at that meeting?

CHAIRMAN: Oh, yes. I think that would be --

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: We would devote as much time as we need.

CHAIRMAN: Certainly. And I will let the Commission know that, and if they --
I suspect that's probably fine.

Commissioner Jones?

COMMISSIONER JONES: Just like to make a couple of comments. I think as a new Commissioner, new member of this organization, a matrix would be helpful just so everybody's aware I think of the T-Mobile petition. I think the reply comments are due February 23rd, are they not, Anna?

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER JONES: So I don't know, Tom, what your -- since Tom Navin said asap, if the reply comments close on the 23rd, what does that mean? That's my first kind of cross (indiscernible) question. Are you suggesting, Tom, that NANC develop some sort of matrix with what has been resolved since the mail-for-order, kind of what has been resolved, what hasn't, and get it to the FCC after the date the reply comments close on T-Mobile?

CHAIRMAN: Yes. I believe so. I think that's -- this is an informal rule-making proceeding under the FCC rules. So it is what's called a permit but disclose meeting, which means that you can comment, or submissions outside the comment period are accepted, provided they're public.

COMMISSIONER JONES: Okay.

CHAIRMAN: And we are not an advocacy body, so we're in a federal advisory

committee and, you know, he asked for our advice on this. And so we can kind of send it whenever we want to. It's obviously important for us to send it in when it becomes timely, so I would say yes, mid-March is probably a good timeframe. The fact that reply comments are due towards the end February, that means that the Commission can issue an order as soon as March but I think that, you know, there's a lot of work that goes into creating an order. And I think what we do will also be possibly part of that consideration. So I think that's pretty good timing.

COMMISSIONER JONES: So at the March meeting we will create a matrix of resolved and unresolved intermodal porting issues and the current status of each.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. Excellent.

COMMISSIONER JONES: And I think that would be very helpful for at least this Commissioner, too, just to let everybody know there is -- and Anna can elaborate on this. Before NARUC meeting next week there is a resolution being circulated I think primarily by T-Mobile and some of the wireless carriers on the wireless to wireline issue. So this resolution is going to be debated. I've offered some amendments to it. I think it's going to be discussed. So I don't know just -- if people aren't aware of that already, it is going to be discussed within the NARUC context at our winter meeting. Some of my concerns when I initially saw the resolution were that the resolution of these issues, since I'm relatively new to the process and I don't know what's been resolved since May of 2004 and what hasn't, that we're selectively taking certain issues out of the NANC process and taking it into another process. And that concerns me, but I have been briefed by various carriers on the issue. But it is going to be a fairly contentious issue at least in the NARUC forum next week.

CHAIRMAN: And let me just make clear based on what Commissioner Jones

just said. In the summary of issues, I do think that it should be a comprehensive summary. It shouldn't just be of the issues that are related to the T-Mobile petition. I think it's issues related to intermodal portability, because I believe that request from the May 2004 report was on the question generally. So it would include questions related to the position paper we just did. I mean, even though that's not specific to wireline and wireless, that is specific to intermodal. Anna? And then I have an announcement to make.

MS. MILLER: Anna Miller with T-Mobile. I'd like to make two clarification points. And I want you to know that I'm trying to be very conscientious to do it in the context of advisory, not advocacy. And I wanted the NANC to understand that T-Mobile's Sprint Nextel port petition focuses on two things. It focuses on simple ports only, so the context of the clarification is for simple ports, not complex ports. And the second point I want to make is that it also focuses on the port validation process, irrespective of whether the port request is an intermodal port request or an intramodal wireless or wireline. So we're really not focusing just on intermodal porting. We're focusing on the entire porting process and it's not just intermodal. So in that context, we're really trying to focus the petition not on intermodal wireless versus wireline porting, but the total porting process from competitive versus incumbent carrier perspective. So I just wanted to make that clarification if that helps. And so what we tried to do is take the NANC's intermodal porting recommendation, which by the way T-Mobile supports, and take it one step further, because it had the caveat of we stay within the same parameters in terms of simple ports, but it had the caveat of err free. So what we've tried to do is make it more convenient for consumers by addressing the err free, how do you achieve err free through the port validation process. So I just wanted to

clarify the context of the clarification. It's not just intermodal, and it is just simple port.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. So that actually raises -- because I had just make a statement that we should not be limited to the things that are in the T-Mobile petition, and we should be limited to intermodal. But if it's beyond intermodal, I'm trying to get a sense as to whether there's any limiting factor on the report that we're talking about generating. I mean, I want it to be comprehensive in terms of what the Working Group and what the NANC has worked on. So I'm kind of open to suggestions. Rosemary?

MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint Nextel. I think it's a perfect place to start.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. And if people feel the need to expand later, they're free to contact me and we can figure that out.

COMMISSIONER JONES: But we will focus on intermodal in general in terms of the matrix that we're putting together.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. Very good. I appreciate it.

I've been informed the federal government is closing at 2 o'clock, so it's a good thing we're skipping our breaks. So we have a half hour left. I want to make sure we have time for public business and public comment. So future numbering -- is Jim here?

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: (Indiscernible.)

CHAIRMAN: Oh, you have it? Okay.

JEROME: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN: Yes?

JEROME: Since there is no NAPM LLC presentation, I wonder what's your pleasure in terms of NCTA briefly mentioning a NAPM issue?

CHAIRMAN: I apologize. That slipped my mind. Yes, Jerome actually had one

LNP question or issue he just wanted to state.

JEROME: Yes, thank you. Jerome (indiscernible), NCTA. And as you're aware, Mr. Chairman, on February 8th Cox Communications, a cable company, announced to you and to NANC that it has chosen not to renew its membership in NAPM. Cox was a founding member of NAPM and also its regional predecessors. And NCTA wanted to highlight this because the concern raised over the fact that now the representation on NAPM contains no cable companies and virtually no CLECs, limiting membership to incumbent local exchange carriers and a few wireless providers. And of course that's particularly relevant in light of the establishment of number portability in the United States. The basis for it was the competition, and it's important to know just what has happened to the NAPM.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. I appreciate you putting that on the record. Yes, I received that notice from Cox yesterday, Monday that they were not going to be part of the LLC.

JEROME: I might add they of course will continue to be a member of NANC, and unfortunately Beth had an emergency to attend to today, otherwise she'd be here.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. And I do recognize and appreciate the contributions that they've made. I do believe it's important that there be broad industry participation in both the NANC and the NAPM. So I'm glad you raised that point, Jerome.

Okay. Let's move on. Yes, Future of Numbering.

Report of the Future of Numbering Working Group (FoN WG)

MR. GRAY: I believe this is Exhibit 13. First thing I need to do when I get home is call Jim Castagna and find out is his weather threshold lower than most of us, or did he know something that we didn't know. So very quickly, let me try to summarize this instead of going into excruciating detail on every page.

The Future of Numbering Working Group, if you've not had an opportunity to stop by and visit on some of our meetings, you will find out just about everything that's going on out there. We may not go into detail on it, but at least you're going to be exposed to a lot of the new technologies, the new uses of what used to be a plain old, ten-digit POTTS number. People are coming up with new and different ways to use them all the time. And so what we have been trying to do is to whittle through all of these and make a determination of which one should we pursue and which one should we not pursue. To do that we've started to kind of backtrack a little bit, establish a process and some methodology by which we want to do that.

So we've come up with a new form that we haven't had before. We call it an AID form, Activity Project Identification Form. On slide 5 we have the basic areas of information, and we're asking everybody to standardize what they give us so we have an absolute minimum amount of information for each issue. The co-chairs will review that information, and when they deem that everything is present, it will be presented to the body as a whole to review. And through consensus we will accept or reject the item, or perhaps send it back for, we don't have enough detail here.

During presentation if there's more than one sponsor, at least one of those sponsors must be present to answer questions or assist the body in reviewing the topic. Once the topic has been assigned as an item that the Future of Numbering is going to pursue, the ownership then belongs to the body and not to the presenters any more. So up until that point, all the presenters could agree to withdraw, or all the presenters could agree to do something different. But once assigned, it belongs to the body and the body will process it from there.

We had a tracking matrix which is on slide 8 that we had quite a bit of detail on.

We're going to make a combination of the information that will be on the AID forms, and come up with a simplified activity identification matrix that basically will be, what's the tracking number, what's the date we got it, the title, the status, and what's our next step or the date for the next step to try to simplify that.

Some of the new and future services that we've been working on or obviously to come up with this process and start looking at international uses of the NANP resources ranging from ENUM to selective routing of calls to a particular type of technology. So we're looking into a lot of areas. The one thing that we would like to ask the NANC to do is if they have no other thoughts or ideas, is to basically get the NANC of this AID process or this methodology of collecting the data, whittling down the topics, and then assigning the topics and moving forward on them.

And our next meeting is going to be March 5th, 2:00 to 4:00 eastern.

CHAIRMAN: Are there any objections to the process? I think it's actually a really good idea to get these things clarified. Yes?

MR. WHALEY: Yes, Mike Whaley, Qwest. And I'd like to thank Don and his fellow co-chairs. They've been doing a great job of coordinating a group that I think is having a difficult time getting their arms around it. But I think this is a great first step and I look forward to continuing to work with them.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. And I think my goal for meetings is going to be to give the Future of Numbering more than five minutes to talk. I think they're going to go first next time. Anna?

MS. MILLER: Anna Miller with T-Mobile. I just want to second what Mike said, and also it's always difficult to develop a NANC process. So actually the FoN did a very good job in getting that accomplished in a short amount of time. And as a FoN

member, even though we spend a lot of time in discussion about the future, it's been very useful I think for me, and I believe the other participants are actively engaged because it's been a very meaningful and interesting discussion in helping us understand what is coming down in the future. And to me, almost more beneficial than other FoNs that I've worked in, well even though we produced a 473-page report, I think we really kind of have a good framework now and background on what is going on and what this forum will be able to vent to kind of focus our efforts on topics that need to be addressed in the context of member conservation and administration.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Is there further discussion? I don't see any -- thank you, Don. I'm skipping, fast-forwarding ahead. You know, as a federal advisory committee we are obligated to seek public comment participation. And I think a couple of people actually talked to me. So I wanted to make sure we had a time to address those questions from the public, or issues that someone might raise or choose to raise. And I'm going to try to -- we've really got to get out of here at quarter till, because these guys are going to shut down. Okay.

Public Comments and Participation

MR. MAZZONE: Tom Mazzone, Telecordia Technologies. Telecordia finds several serious problems with the NAPM LLC's recent renewal of the NPAC amendment with NEUSTAR, the current vendor. We ask that the NANC reinitialize the legal expert's working group, or an ad-hoc issues management group to review the NPAC contract amendment for lawfulness, reasonableness, and fairness. In Telecordia's view, the amendment should be voided. We ask that the NANC direct the LLC to avoid this amendment. At a minimum, the LLC should be required to move the anti-competitive provisions of the amendment immediately. The LLC should be required to exercise its

non-exclusivity provisions and immediately commence an RFP process for an alternative NPAC solution, either as a multiple NPAC per region or as a complete re-bid process. If the entire amendment is not voided, any language that refers to TM-level solutions must be voided as beyond the scope of the LLC and NANC. Any language restraining customers or whatever is referred to as subscribing customers advocating for or considering alternatives must be removed, and to remove what may be referred to as billable transactions from NANC 400 which is beyond the scope of the NPAC.

Telecordia intends to pursue this issue with NANC who has responsibility for oversight of the issue and to participate with NANC in any other industry venue that might be proper to reach the conclusions needed, to include the FCC or beyond if necessary, and to follow appropriate resolution, escalation, and legal processes. We ask that this issue be made a discussion item for the next meeting on the way to forming either and IMG or a LEWG. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN. Okay. Thank you, Tom. Are there comments? Discussion? Yes?

MR. HULTQUIST: Hank Hultquist, AT&T. I'd just like to reiterate my comments that I made earlier in terms of a legal expertise working group having some sort of broad charter. I formally was a member of such a group in this body, and I do believe that it's actually not an appropriate function of the NANC, that this is not an issue, that any legal issues are not issues that the NANC is particularly expert in. And they are issues on which the AT&T -- the FCC is sufficiently expert, that it doesn't need our advice.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. Jerome?

JEROME: Jerome Candelaria, NCTA. I appreciate what you're saying about

where the sufficient expertise lies. The question for me is how this body gets that their NANC is charged with some degree of oversight. At our last NANC meeting, NCTA and Cox expressed interest in looking a little deeper into the extension of the contract. And so if not for the legal group, I'd like to see some form of consideration here at NANC.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL: (Indiscernible.) Yes, I think that's actually the appropriate way to think about this, is to put something on the agenda to talk about, what is the appropriate role for a body like NANC that really is expert in numbering matters to advise the FCC on questions that may arise in this context. I think that is a useful debate to potentially have.

CHAIRMAN: Commissioner Jones?

COMMISSIONER JONES: Mr. Chairman -- Phillip Jones from Washington. I would echo Hank's comments just as a state commissioner. And I defer to your judgment if the NANC did have a legal issues group or any sort of legal advice before I -- I value Hank's experience in that. And just looking upon what a state commission does, when we have legal advice we go to our state Attorney General for advice. We don't try to ad-hoc and make it up on the spot. And I think we should kind of focus on what we do best here at NANC, and that is technical work regarding number resources. So it seems to me on its face that rather than setting up a new body, we should stick to what we do. That's not to say we don't hear from the public and address it in some manner. But to setup a new body, I think Hank makes some good points.

CHAIRMAN: Rosemary, were you first or did you --: do you want to ask? And Jerome was next.

JEROME: (Indiscernible) policy group as well, and it's hard to separate some of

these legal questions from policy. So at a minimum I think that this group should, as mentioned, at least consider where the appropriate place to begin to address this issue is.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. And I do look at Commissioner rule 52-26(b)(3). It does charge us with oversight -- it's actually, I'm going oversight of the Number Portability Administration. And so there's a question as to what that is, but that is in the Commission rules. And so -- I know Anna has something, but I just wanted to point out actually that I had received a letter from Telcordia late last week on many of the things that were mentioned, but not all frankly. And it was in written form and I did actually ask. I'd like the record to reflect that I did ask the LLC and NEUSTAR to provide their response in writing on those, that the statements in terms of the characterization of the contract. And we'll distribute those responses when we have them. Until we get those responses, it's not entirely clear what we should be doing at this point in time. So it might be right in a few weeks or something like that for us to further consider. But that was at least the step that I've taken now, although I did know that the Telcordia representative did in his statement just now pose some different questions that I remember from the letter. So frankly I would ask, if you do have something different, please try to encapsulate those into maybe a second letter or something rather than just relying on an oral statement on a day when we've had six inches of snow.

Anna? And then I really apologize. I don't want to cut this debate off. I don't want to brush it aside, but they are closing the government in a few minutes.

MS. MILLER: Anna Miller with T-Mobile. And I agree with your comments with regard to the NANC's responsibilities as an oversight committee for number portability. And as an (indiscernible) LLC member, we always recognize that authority and we also recognize the ultimate authority of the FCC. In that context, another point

I'd like to make is that the NANPA LLC is always open to membership. We would love to have more membership in the NAPM LLC. There's even a group that's actively trying to recruit that. So we're always looking for new membership. And the other point that I'd like to make is that the NAPM LLC is management for the master contract, does have the means, we do have a process for addressing new proposals, we're always open to new proposals and better propositions. So I just wanted to make those two points clear.

And finally I wanted to point out that this negotiation was a non-exclusive contract. So again, we're always open to new proposals, always open to better proposals. And meanwhile, the industry as a result of this negotiation, we're saving industry money. And the performance requirements are being met, and it's been very good performance from the NPAC.

CHAIRMAN: Thirty seconds.

MS. EMMER: Rosemary Emmer, Sprint Nextel. Quickly, I think it would be most appropriate if whatever questions or comments any vendor has go directly to the LLC, copy you, as I understand they did last week. And let the LLC fully respond to every one before this group gets involved in adding this to an agenda item. I think the experts with the contract are at the LLC, and I think that given what I've heard today, these are issues that need to be resolved in-house at the LLC first before they're at the NANC. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. And 52.26(b)3 says parties shall attempt to resolve between themselves, but it does allow the NANC outlet to a certain extent.

Again, I don't want to cut off discussion on this, but we do have an obligation to let the people who are working here leave and clean up before the government closes. So I do appreciate everyone coming out today. And normally I would go over the action

items and all that, but what I think I'll probably just do is send an e-mail around saying those things. But I do appreciate everybody coming out. And I wish everyone safe travels home, either in the air or on the ground. Thank you.

(MEETING CONCLUDED.)

(END OF AUDIOTAPE 2, SIDE B)

* * * * *

CERTIFICATE OF AGENCY

I, Carol J. Schwartz, President of Carol J. Thomas Stenotype Reporting Services, Inc., do hereby certify we were authorized to transcribe the submitted cassette tapes, and that thereafter these proceedings were transcribed under our supervision, and I further certify that the forgoing transcription contains a full, true and correct transcription of the cassettes furnished, to the best of our ability.

CAROL J. SCHWARTZ

PRESIDENT